THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 9. DECEMBER, 1932. Vol. XXII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Winchester Cathedral and Permanent Reservation.

We publish in our correspondence pages this month a lay protest against the introduction of the practice of permanent Reservation in Winchester Cathedral. At the Basingstoke Ruridecanal Conference, Mr. W. H. Cobb moved the following resolution :

'That this Conference strongly deprecates the practice of permanent Reservation in our Cathedral; and that a representation to that effect be made to the Bishop.'

This protest had been preceded by the circulation for signature of a memorial addressed to the Bishop of Winchester in the following terms :

To the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Winchester, D.D.

We, the undersigned, being members of the Church of England resident in the Diocese of Winchester, desire to approach your Lordship with the utmost respect for your Lordship's office, with reference to a grave illegality perpetually practised in Winchester Cathedral, namely, the Reservation of the Sacrament.

1. The Dean of Winchester stated in St. Peter's Hall, Bournemouth, on June 6th of this year, 'To-day we can reserve the Blessed Sacrament in the Cathedral . . . We hope there will be no controversy about it at all.'

2. We respectfully submit that this practice is against the laws of 'this Church and Realm.'

3. (*a*) In 1885 Reservation of the Sacrament for any purpose whatsoever was condemned by the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation. (*b*) In 1900 this condemnation was re-affirmed by the Archbishops in the 'Lambeth Opinion,' after hearing both sides of the question from eminent Counsel. (*c*) In 1901 every Bishop on the Bench gave his assent to the 'Lambeth Opinion.' (*d*) In 1906, in the case of the Bishop

of Oxford *v.* Henly, the Dean of the Arches pronounced Reservation for any purpose whatsoever to be illegal. (*e*) In 1920 the King's Bench Division, in the case of Gore Booth *v.* Bishop of Manchester, held Reservation to be an illegal practice. (*f*) Quite recently the Reservation of the Sacrament has been condemned in two Faculty cases in the Diocese of Truro.

4. We respectfully submit to your Lordship that, in view of these definite pronouncements, it is impossible for us as law-abiding Englishmen to refrain from protesting against this flagrant illegality.

5. We respectfully submit that the introduction of the Reservation of the Sacrament into the Cathedral is likely to cause strife and contention, for which those who introduced the practice will not be able to escape responsibility. The issue is so plain that we find ourselves wholly unable to join in the Dean of Winchester's 'hope that there will be no controversy about it at all.'

6. We believe that Winchester is the only Cathedral besides Truro in which the Sacrament is reserved. We deprecate our Cathedral being brought into this unhappy prominence.

7. We need hardly point out to your Lordship that the Church of England makes ample provision in the Service for the Communion of the Sick and in the rubrics appended thereto for any case of urgent need for the reception of the Communion by the sick and dying.

8. We would respectfully submit to your Lordship that one of the main reasons for the rejection of the Deposited Prayer Book by the House of Commons was the introduction of facilities for Reservation, and that, even after certain safeguards with reference to the practice had been introduced into the Deposited Prayer Book, it was rejected by the House of Commons by an even larger majority than on the first occasion.

9. We submit that at the Cathedral, being the principal Church of the Diocese, an example of the strict observance of law should be set, and that nothing should be introduced therein which can give offence to any 'sober, peaceable and truly conscientious sons' of the Church in the Diocese.

10. We would remind your Lordship of your recent proposal that there should be 'a truce of God among ourselves for a period of ten years in which we absolutely refrain from controversy.'

11. We therefore humbly beg your Lordship, as Visitor of the Cathedral, to require the discontinuance of the practice of Reservation at the Cathedral, on the grounds (i) that it is illegal, and (ii) that it is and will continue to be a serious cause of controversy throughout the Diocese.

We are your Lordship's humble servants.

To this respectful and admirably reasoned document Dr. Garbett, the recently appointed Bishop of Winchester, replied as follows :

DEAR MR. COBB,

I am sorry that absence on pilgrimage, and the pressure of work which followed, have prevented me from replying before to your letter. The Consecrated Elements have been reserved in the Cathedral for nearly a year. The Dean and Chapter were unanimously in favour of doing this, and my predecessor Dr. Woods gave his consent. As you

no doubt are aware, the Dean is Ordinary of the Cathedral, and I have no intention of attempting to overrule, even if I have the power, the decision which was made by him and the Chapter and consented to by my predecessor.

With kind regards, yours very sincerely,

Wolvesey. CYRIL WINTON.
September 28th.

The reply of the Bishop for those who pay attention to the precise significance of the conditional clause means that although he is aware that he possesses the power, he is not willing to forbid the illegal action of the Dean and Chapter. As Bishop of Winchester he is the Visitor of the cathedral, and although he can interfere in no way with the activities of the cathedral body when legally exerted, he has the power to intervene effectively in the case of flagrant illegality and disorder.

We recognize the extremely difficult situation in which Dr. Garbett is placed. As a newcomer to the diocese he naturally desires to enter peacefully upon a new stage of his career of beneficent service. Furthermore, the permission, secretive though we presume secure, given by his predecessor not long before his death, to reserve the Sacrament permanently in the Cathedral of the Diocese, is one which Dr. Garbett must naturally feel unwilling publicly to revoke as seeming to cast a reflection upon both the loyalty and the wisdom of a much respected predecessor. Nevertheless, the Bishops of the Church of England are under the law of the Church of England and have solemnly and publicly taken oaths to administer that law, and about the law of the Church of England in the matter of permanent Reservation there is, as the memorial shows, no doubt whatsoever.

However distasteful and difficult the duty demanded may seem to Dr. Garbett, he is in virtue of his office and his obligations bound to take action in this matter, or else to bring discredit upon the English Episcopate for what a growing number of the laity must regard as either disloyal or cowardly connivance at the Romeward movement in the English Church.

To a true lover of peace, as the Bishop undoubtedly is, the injudicious and provocative proclamation of Dr. Selwyn, the Dean of Winchester, as cited by the memorialists, must have been extremely embarrassing.

We have no desire to deal with an issue of this kind at this time. The failure of the episcopate to suppress the Romanizing movement since the second rejection of the Deposited Book, when they took the law into their own hands, is having most disastrous effects on the prestige and influence of the National Church. A letter which we publish in this number of the *Modern Churchman* from the Vicar of Ealing, in which he speaks of a number of churches as becoming 'deserted' owing to the increase of these practices, is as true of the city with which he is acquainted as of country places. The falling revenues of the Church and the large reduction in the number of assistant clergy supported by the voluntary gifts of the parishioners, is but another form of the silent protest of the laity against Romanizing.

Of course what takes place at the frequent and secret conclaves of our bishops we have no power of learning, but whatever their private decisions may be, at least their public activities give little indication that they are able by their present methods to cope with what Archbishop Tait described as 'a conspiracy within our own body against the doctrine, the discipline, and the practice of our Reformed Church.'

It is distasteful to us in days when a spirit of national unity both in State and Church is so urgently needed to have to deal with this issue, but like the judicious Hooker, himself a sincere lover of peace, 'we cannot basely through silence allow things to pass away as in a dream.'

Afrikander Fundamentalism and the Stellenbosching of Professor du Plessis.

Problems which vexed the Anglican Communion in the period between Bishop Colenso's Pentateuchal Criticism and the publication of *Lux Mundi*, some half-century ago, are apparently burning questions to-day in the Calvinistic Dutch Church of South Africa.

The case of Professor du Plessis which has dragged on for some years has just advanced another stage in its tortuous career. The *Cape Times* of 9th, 10th and 11th November published full accounts of the latest turn which this case has taken.

Professor du Plessis is a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, and a professor of many years standing in their theological seminary at Stellenbosch. The Professor has been under suspicion of heresy for many years, and this has been kept alive chiefly by his editorship of a magazine which he founded entitled *Het Zoeklicht* (*The Searchlight*), which discusses theological questions in a spirit of freedom and enlightenment and exhibits the influence of modern Biblical criticism.

As a consequence, in 1928 the *Curatorium* decided to lodge a charge of heterodoxy against the Professor with the *Ring*. The *Ring* made a thorough enquiry lasting thirteen days, and pronounced Professor du Plessis not guilty in September 1929. The *Curatorium*, however, was not satisfied with this decision, and appealed to the *Synod*, a much larger and less learned body. This action of the *Curatorium* dashed to the ground all hopes of a peaceful settlement. Professor du Plessis was deposed from his chair.

On the advice of two of his colleagues in the seminary, Professor du Plessis decided to appeal from the hostile decision of the ecclesiastical authorities to the Civil Courts. The appeal to Caesar succeeded. The Civil Courts reversed the decision and placed Professor du Plessis in a position to return to his work immediately. The ecclesiastical authorities still pressed the Professor to resign, and although they offered him full salary for the remaining years of his professorship and the full pension to which he was entitled on retirement if he would consent not to return to his work, he honourably refused this proposal, being assured that should he consent to it, it would inevitably limit the comprehensiveness of his Church and check the rising spirit of theological freedom.

On November 10th, 1932, the Dutch Reformed Synod in full session, after much animated discussion, decided by 217 votes to 112 to dismiss Professor du Plessis from his chair in Stellenbosch Theological Seminary.

The Rev. F. X. Roome, the Professor's leading defendant, maintained in a spirited speech that this dispute had passed far beyond the limits of sectarian ecclesiasticism. The whole public of South Africa was interested. Among the Professor's supporters were not only most of his old students, but also the mis-

sionaries of their own Church abroad and the leaders of many other Protestant Churches. In making their decision they had to consider the needs of the professional classes within their own communion and also the needs of the rising generations of University students.

It is obvious that the decision of Professor du Plessis' opponents is fraught with extremely serious consequences for their Church. It will probably involve fresh, and for them, disastrous legal proceedings and will deal a deadly blow to the cause of religious tolerance and enlightenment within their own communion. It is worth while noting that once again the cause of religious freedom when betrayed by ecclesiastics has been rescued by the Civil Courts.

The story is as old as St. Paul who appealed from the Sanhedrin to Caesar, but it needs to be repeated from age to age that the Church may be reminded of its lesson.

THE MODERNIZING OF AMERICAN CATHOLICISM.

Mr. Norman Pittenger in an interesting article entitled 'What is Liberal Catholicism?' in the *Christian Century* of October 5th, 1932, indicates the great advances which Modernist thought is making among Anglo-Catholics. An attentive student of the *Church Times* of the last few weeks reading between the editorial lines of that journal will observe that it also is turning towards the East. Mr. Pittenger sets forth briefly and enthusiastically the causes and values and future of Liberal Catholicism within the Anglican communion.

He begins by asserting that 'fundamentalism is dead and that there can never be a return to the Protestantism of Calvin and Luther.' This is a bold statement to make in the United States. It is not, however, the fundamentalism of Calvin and Luther, but the fundamentalism of Moody and Buchmann which is the kind of fundamentalism which attracts to-day. He also is clear, as English Modernists have been for some years past, that Liberal Protestantism of the continental type is too individualist, vague and negative to be able to offer a spiritual home to those who feel they need one.

Catholicism of the modern Roman and Mediaeval types seem to Mr. Pittenger to be equally inadequate. He writes:

'But Roman Catholicism has been in an equally bad way. Despite its astonishing wealth of devotional life, its adherence to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity (which it has interpreted in an extremely rigid manner), and the beautiful worship which centres in the mass, the Roman Church has been narrowed and arid. The official mentality, with its dogmatic insistence on unimportant detail, and the shutting of the doors on much of the best modern thought, have done the Roman Church no end of harm. It has been placed, and not entirely unfairly, on a plane with the Protestant fundamentalists, since its attitude toward modern criticism and scientific investigation has only too often been similar to theirs.'

Anglo-Catholicism with its strongly imitative bent has been too much under the influence of mediaeval and modern Romanism to develop in accordance with that freedom and originality which is its rightful heritage. In depreciating these tendencies in Anglo-Catholicism an exception must be made of Bishop Gore and the great leaders of the *Lux Mundi* school.

The influence of this school is happily a growing one, and is now passing steadily beyond the limits set by its great leaders, even as they passed beyond the limits which were regarded as lawful by their predecessors.

Mr. Pittenger writes:

'In both England and America, the Liberal Catholic spirit is winning the day, and already its influence is being felt in the Protestant churches. The leaders of Liberal Catholicism believe that it is quite impossible to shut one's eyes to new truth, but they also believe that the main stream of Catholic faith and life holds the essential values of Christianity, and that these must be preserved. A process of interpenetration is at work: the Anglo-Catholic party is now 'honeycombed with Modernism,' as a not very sympathetic critic remarked, and the Modernist party is turning very definitely in the Catholic direction. Anyone who knows both movements from the inside will admit these facts.'

Mr. Pittenger finds in Dr. Paul Elmer More's writings an admirable presentation of this movement in America. He summarizes the main points in the Liberal Catholic position as follows:

'Liberal Catholicism stands for the maintenance of the central affirmations of historical Christianity as a religion centering about the person and work of Jesus Christ, while at the same time it welcomes all new knowledge from whatever source it may come and continually seeks to reinterpret the tradition in the light of that knowledge. It endeavours to combine the freedom of enquiry emphasized by Modernism, with the historical Catholic faith in God's supremely effectual and definitive self-revelation in Jesus Christ. It values highly the age-old devotional and sacramental system; and, truly Catholic in emphasis, finds in the eucharist or the mass the central act of Christian worship. Here, the Liberal Catholic believes, there is in some real sense a unique

presence of Christ, so that the consecrated elements may legitimately be called "the body and blood of Christ" as the instrumental symbols whereby His risen life is communicated to men. In this the eucharist carries on the incarnation process, as in another sense the Catholic Church itself carries it on, since the Incarnation itself is an effective symbol of the divine presence and activity.'

Mr. Pittenger thus summarizes the Liberal Catholic objective as:

'A humble, but not an uncritical, acceptance of the Christian tradition, and a sincere and loyal restatement of that faith and life for our own age. He finds his primary authority in the continually growing consensus of saints and scholars and "holy and humble men of heart," concerning the truth of that tradition. It is a living authority, expanding from age to age, and when seen in that light, it becomes true that we could not believe the Gospel *nisi catholicae nos commoveret auctoritas,* as St. Augustine put it.

'The Bible is to be regarded as the book of the Church, never in itself alone an authoritative guide to faith and morals. The Liberal Catholic regards the faith as dynamic, and expects a constant development of doctrine; and he does not seek for Scriptural proof-texts for ancient or modern theological definitions or devotional practices, although he would insist that none must be adopted which is *contrary* to the classic presentation of Christianity found in our earliest records, the New Testament. Christianity is a growing body of truth, based on the faith which is implicit in the persistent experience of a new life of communion with God mediated by the incarnate, crucified and risen Christ, and imparted to men in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit—that is to say, given in the charismatic community which is informed and guided by Christ Himself. Dogma is thus to be regarded as a generalization of a persistent experience; and no dogma is of ultimate value which does not safeguard some essential element of that experience.'

Mr. Pittenger closes his paper with a fine quotation from *New Horizons of the Christian Faith* by Dean Grant, of the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago:

'A faith so potent through successive ages, so various in its manifestations, so adaptable to changing conditions in generation after generation, so rich in the spiritual illumination of different races and nations of men, has still a secret to unfold in this new age. In fact, one cannot well share the "Catholic" outlook in the twentieth century unless he is something of a "Modernist," nor be an ardent "Modernist" unless he has caught some glimpse of the meaning of the Catholic faith in the past . . . The great age of the Church is still to come. We are still "in the morning of the times," and the early period of the Church's history is not yet over. Perhaps we in this very generation are among those that stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power.'

With this American ideal of the general lines which Christian evolution must take if it is to carry out its mission of salvation to mankind, English Modernists are heartily in sympathy.

The more discerning English Modernists have long felt that the modernizing of Catholicism, no less than the modernizing of Evangelicalism must be secured as a condition of ultimate success, and that in some ways Catholicism lends itself more readily to this fructifying process than does Evangelicalism.

A Revised Catechism.

The following revised Catechism, drawn up by the Birmingham Branch of the Modern Churchmen's Union, 'and sanctioned by the Bishop of Birmingham for use in the Diocese of Birmingham as a basis of teaching,' deserves attention :

The Church Catechism Revised.

Q. What is your name?

A. (*Here the child shall give his or her Christian name.*)

Q. Who gave you this name?

A. My Godfathers and Godmothers in my baptism.

Q. What did your Godfathers and Godmothers then do for you?

A. They did promise three things in my name :
First, that I should renounce all evil ; Secondly, that I should believe the Christian Faith ; Thirdly, that I should keep God's Holy Will, and walk in the same all the days of my life.

Q. Do you not think you are bound to believe and to do as they have promised for you?

A. Yes ; and by God's help so I will. And I heartily thank our heavenly Father that He has called me to this spiritual sonship, through Jesus Christ our Saviour. And I pray unto God to give me His grace that I may continue in the same unto the end of my life.

Catechist :

You have promised to believe the Christian Faith.

Repeat the statement of it made by the Church and known as the Apostles' Creed.

Answer :

We believe in God ;
the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth :
And in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord, Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, He descended into hell ; the third day he rose again from the dead, He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty ; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.
We believe in the Holy Ghost ; the Holy Catholic Church ; the Communion of Saints ; the Forgiveness of sins ; the Resurrection of the body ; and the Life everlasting ; Amen.

Catechist:

Repeat this statement of it in the words of Holy Scripture.

Answer:

We believe

God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

God is Light, and that if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.

God is Love, and that everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.

Jesus is the Son of God, and that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.

We are the children of God, and that He hath given us of His Spirit.

If we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.

The world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.

Q. What do you chiefly learn by these statements of the Christian faith?

A. I learn to believe in God, Who has made Himself known to us—

First, through His age-long work of creation, wherein He forms us for the knowledge of Himself, wherefore we call Him Father;

Secondly, through the life of Jesus Christ our Saviour, Who unveiled to men the character and will of God;

Thirdly, through the Holy Spirit, the Life-giver, Who sanctifies us in His freedom, truth and love; and leads us into the family of the Church, called to be One, Holy, Catholic, Christ's fellowship in earth and heaven.

Catechist:

You said that your Godfathers and Godmothers promised that you should keep God's Holy Will.

Repeat the Ten Commandments given in the Old Testament:—

(1) Thou shalt have none other gods but Me.
(2) Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image.
(3) Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.
(4) Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath-day.
(5) Honour thy father and thy mother.
(6) Thou shalt do no murder.
(7) Thou shalt not commit adultery.
(8) Thou shalt not steal.
(9) Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.
(10) Thou shalt not covet.

Q. What did Jesus Christ say of these Commandments?

A. He told us that they were said by them of old time, and He taught us to understand some in a new way, that all of them may govern the thoughts of the heart, and thus control the outward act, for true goodness must spring from within.

Q. What does Jesus Christ teach us to be the supreme motive of life?

A. Love, for the two great commandments are:—

(1) Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind;

(2) And thy neighbour as thyself.

Q. Where does Jesus Christ describe the manner of men He would wish us to be?

A. In the Sermon on the Mount, where He says:

'Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

'Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted.

'Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth.

'Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled.

'Blessed are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy.

'Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God.

'Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the children of God.

'Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.'

Q. What, therefore, is your duty towards God?

A. My duty towards God is to believe in Him, and to love Him with all my heart, with all my mind, with all my soul, and with all my strength; to worship Him, to give Him thanks, to put my whole trust in Him, to call upon Him in prayer, to honour His holy Name and His Word, and to serve Him truly all the days of my life.

Q. What, then, is your duty towards your neighbour?

A. My duty towards my neighbour is to love him as myself, and to do to all men as I would they should do unto me; To love, honour, and succour my father and mother; To honour and obey the King, and all that are put in authority under him; To order myself with gentleness and courtesy to all my fellows; To hurt nobody by word or deed; To be true and just in all my dealing; To bear no malice or hatred in my heart; To render to none evil for evil, but to overcome evil with good; To keep my hands from picking and stealing, and my tongue from evil-speaking, lying and slandering; To be pure and temperate in thought, word and deed; Not to covet or desire other men's goods, but to learn and labour truly, and to do my duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call me.

Catechist:

If we are to know God and to serve Him, we need His help. In what way shall we seek it?

A. By prayer, which Jesus Christ taught His disciples to use both by His word and example.

Q. Why did Jesus Christ give us the Lord's Prayer?

A. He gave us the Lord's Prayer to teach us the spirit of all prayer, and said: 'After this manner pray ye.'

Catechist:

Let me hear, then, if you can say the Lord's Prayer.

A. 'Our Father, which are in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil.'

Q. What lessons do we learn from it to guide our prayers?

A. First, we learn to seek God and His glory above all things, and to draw near to Him with reverence.

Secondly, we learn to pray for the coming of His kingdom on earth, the kingdom of righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit.

Thirdly, we learn to pray not only for ourselves, but for all men, for all are brethren and members one of another;

Fourthly, we learn to make request for the needs of the body as well as of the soul;

Fifthly, we learn that we must forgive, if we ourselves would receive God's forgiveness;

Sixthly, we learn to ask for God's guidance and protection in our daily life.

Thus we may become true children of our Father Who is in heaven.

Catechist:

Q. How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in His Church?

A. Two only, as generally necessary to salvation, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

Q. What meanest thou by this word *Sacrament*?

A. I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.

Q. How many parts are there in a Sacrament?

A. Two; the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace.

Q. What is the outward visible sign or form in Baptism?

A. Water; wherein the person is baptised *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

Q. What is the inward and spiritual grace?

A. A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness; for being by nature *prone to* sin, we are hereby made the children of grace.

Q. What is required of persons to be baptised?

A. Repentance, whereby they forsake sin; and Faith, whereby they steadfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that Sacrament.

Q. Why then are Infants baptised, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them?

A. Because they promise them both by their Sureties; which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform.

Q. Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?

A. For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby.

Q. What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper?
A. Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.
Q. What is the inward part, or thing signified?
A. The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.
Q. What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?
A. The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine.
Q. What is required of them who come to the Lord's Supper?
A. To examine themselves, whether they repent them truly of their former sins, steadfastly purposing to lead a new life; have a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ, with a thankful remembrance of His death; and be in charity with all men.

The revisers have succeeded in deftly removing certain ambiguous and inaccurate statements in the Prayer Book Catechism. From the literary point of view, we cannot but feel that the revision lacks the euphony and polish of the Tudor composition.

The revisers were guided in their revision by the following five directions:

1. We would eliminate all suggestion of Tritheism in the presentation of the Creed.

2. We would substitute the Ten Commandments in their shorter form and as 'said by them of old time,' for the form in which they now stand, and relate them to Christ's teaching, so as to emphasise the progressive element in religion, and state more clearly Christ's teaching on conduct, in its inwardness, motive and ideal.

3. For the present paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer we would substitute teaching as to the direction 'After this manner pray ye,' and would emphasise the chief points of guidance the Lord's Prayer affords in the spirit of our prayers.

4. For the avoidance of controversy, we believe it would be advisable that the section on the Sacraments be left for the present unrevised.

5. The archaic language should be modified and omissions rectified.

We can but commend the initiative and courage which has prompted this needful effort to modernize an archaic Church formulary, and hope it will be the precursor of many more. Without many-sided efforts the Church of to-day will not get what she needs, nor in the form in which she needs it. Line upon line: precept upon precept: here a little and there a little.

In this connection, we are assured that the revisers of the Church Catechism will most heartily welcome criticism and suggestion in our correspondence pages.

THE PLACE OF JESUS IN MODERN CHRISTIAN THOUGHT

By the Rev. Canon C. E. Raven, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in Cambridge University.

THIS theme is quite plainly too high for me. Who am I that I should in any sort of way try to express what we Christians feel about Jesus? I know that I cannot hope to represent the opinions of many of my co-religionists here. Indeed I can hardly hope to represent my own deepest feelings and thoughts. Of course, it is an exceedingly difficult theme; it is in the very centre of the division between those of us who are united in this Society; and therefore its treatment demands a tact, a sensitiveness, a sympathy of which I am afraid you will find that I am almost entirely lacking. I can only promise to do one thing, try to be utterly sincere. If I give offence, put it down not to my intention, but to my clumsiness of thought and speech.

It is an overwhelming subject, but, of course, fascinating for those of us who have been keeping in touch with its recent development. For Jewish and Christian scholars have been in these last twenty or thirty years powerfully changing our understanding, not only of the times in which Jesus lived, but of His own contribution to those times, and through them to the days that have followed.

I want to try and set before you my subject under these three main headings. First, as the result of critical studies of the New Testament literature, certain changes in the Christian appreciation of Jesus have taken place. Secondly, during the same period certain changes have taken place in our general outlook upon the philosophy of religion and of religious experience. Those changes are also worth appreciating because they powerfully affect our attitude towards Jesus. Having examined those two headings, I will try to summarize shortly what seem to me to be the salient features of that position which the Christian of

*An address delivered at the Liberal Jewish Synagogue, St. John's Wood Road, on Monday evening, 7th November, 1932, at a meeting of the Society of Jews and Christians.

to-day would ascribe to his Master, and to say a word or two about the possibilities of our united study of that position, how far it does in fact increase the division between us, or how far it holds out hopes that for some at least on each side of the division there may be an approach towards a common outlook.

The development of critical study as it affects the Christian conception of Jesus during my life-time has, of course, been extraordinarily interesting. We began to study, many of us, at a time when, as a result of intensive examination of the text of the New Testament, and especially of the Gospels, Christians had recovered their sense of the manhood of Jesus. I think it is not unfair to say that for many hundreds of years in the Church's history, perhaps almost from the third century, the fact of the manhood of our Master had been obscured more and more. His divinity has been emphasized at the expense not only of the facts of His human life, but of all traces of real manhood in our conception of Him. One of the very great gains, as I think, which the Church has received from the critical studies of the last century has been this sure conviction of the reality of the Son of Man, this sure vision of Jesus, if not immediately as He was in the days of His flesh, at any rate as He appeared to the earliest who testified of Him. That portrait which we generally describe as Liberal Protestant laid particular stress upon His teaching, upon those elements in His teaching which we to a large extent hold in common, His teaching of the Fatherhood of God, of the brotherhood of man, His proclamation of God's Kingdom, all that ethical and religious development which for us Christians is summed up in the Sermon on the Mount. The aspect of the Master as teacher, as herald of the Kingdom, as reformer, as initiator of a new appreciation of the beauty and the worth of human life and human fellowship, was made intensely real by the great Ritschlian scholars of Germany thirty years ago. It was great gain, but it had its weakness. I think it failed—failed badly—to relate Jesus to the historical circumstances of His time. People saw Him rather as a revolutionary preacher whose message was appropriate to the nineteenth and twentieth century, as one who had a word to say upon our local and temporary problems, than as one whose message was primarily addressed to and must primarily be interpreted as applying to the circum-

stances of His own time. To a large extent the figure lacked solidity, lacked that kind of convincing historical reality which we have a right to expect. In consequence, it was exposed to drastic criticism from several different quarters. People said, in effect, 'You scholars of the Liberal Protestant tradition have made of Jesus an amiable twentieth century figure, appropriate to what you conceive to be the mind of the modern man. He was not in the least like that. You must see Him, please, as He was in the days of His flesh, as manifested in the first century, addressing His message in the first instance to the men and women of His time.' That protest burst upon many of us—I am speaking of those within the Christian Churches—in the development of the apocalyptic side of Jesus and His message, recalling attention to those elements in His teaching and life which seemed to proclaim an immediate eruption of the supernatural into the world, those elements which spoke of the 'turning of the sun into darkness and the moon into blood, in the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord,' those elements which looked forward apparently to the speedy return of the Messiah in glory to bring the present age to an end, and in the splendour of the supernatural to usher in, in despite of man, God's Kingdom.

I shall never forget, none of us will forget, the stir and storm which Dr. Albert Schweitzer's book, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, translated in English under the title *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, created in my own university and in religious circles in general. Here was a protest against our Liberal Protestant Jesus; here a *bizarre*, tremendous figure, deluded if you like, but heroic, heroic with the heroism of great tragedy, heroic with the heroism of a Prometheus, flinging Himself upon the wheel of the world in order to force the hand of the Eternal, and violently bring in the Kingdom. That protest filled the early years of my own study of theology, and for a time not only swung over general educated Christian opinion to recognize an element of the sublime in the Master, but threatened to expose Him to the charge of being wholly deluded and mistaken in a matter of the greatest importance. There had been, I suppose, few more searching periods in the history of Christian thinking than those first years when we were faced with the almost convincing por-

trait of the apocalyptic Jesus, so fascinating in many ways, and yet in the last resort so hard to reconcile with what Christian experience claimed to find in Him.

For my own part, and I think for the part of many of my co-religionists, it was very largely to Jewish scholarship that we came to owe a wiser appreciation of apocalyptic. It was my friend, Dr. Abrahams, Reader in Cambridge, who first helped me to see that to a student of contemporary Judaism this stress upon apocalyptic seemed gravely exaggerated. Those who knew the Rabbinic Schools of the first century of the Christian era were not content to admit that Judaism at that time took this apocalyptic prophecy literally. They pointed out, to our great encouragement, that the apocalypse had left almost no trace upon the thought of later Judaism, that though it might have appealed in its crude literal sense to certain dwellers in Galilee, to certain of the Zealots, and might to some extent have been applied to the assault of Rome and the catastrophe of the siege of Jerusalem, the best Jewish thought had always been familiar with such metaphors and had never expected or intended their literal fulfilment.

However that may be, quite certainly, so far as I can judge, it is to Jewish scholars very largely that we owe the next stage in our understanding of Jesus. I have said that it was to Him as a teacher that the Liberal Protestant school drew special attention; yes, but as a teacher to be related to the twentieth century. Dr. Klausner, Dr. Claud Montefiore, and one or two other eminent scholars have helped us to see Jesus not against a background of contemporary apocalyptic, but in the setting of the contemporary synagogues and Rabbinic schools, and have helped us, therefore, to revise our whole appreciation of His relationship, not only to the Old Testament, but to the men and women of His own time. We see Him with a far clearer and fuller understanding of His environment than has ever before been possible; and that discovery of the relationship between Jesus and contemporary Judaism is full of interest, I think, both to Jews and to Christians. For the result of it is that on the one side we have been helped to see that very much which previously we had regarded as original and even as revolutionary in the teaching of Jesus was in fact representative of the best and

wisest of His Jewish contemporaries, that many things which we had set as in contrast with Judaism were not in fact in contrast, but in very clear and definite agreement. And yet, if that is so, we have still to face this, which I think is a necessary question to ask: if, as some of us would say, there is really nothing in the teaching of Jesus essentially different from the teaching of the best and most enlightened of the Rabbis of His time, then to what must we look if we are to explain the difference between His influence and theirs?

We Christians, just because we have come to see the points at which Jesus was less original than we thought, were bound at the same time to see, if we could, how to explain the fact that vast multitudes of human beings—and not the most backward or the least intelligent of the world's population—have ever since been called by His name. Therefore, the very work which seemed to put Jesus among His contemporaries has served—you must forgive me if I say it bluntly—to underline the distinction between Him and them, because it has drawn attention away from the quality of His teaching to the quality of His person. Dr. Klausner, having examined with great insight the teaching of Jesus, having faced with equal insight this same question which I have propounded to you, found himself constrained to say that it is in the personality of Jesus that the secret of His influence must be found.

Now I think that since our recovery of the manhood of the Master and our recovery of the contemporary background of the Master, Christian thought has more and more been concerned with the quality of His person—not primarily any longer with the content of His preaching, or even with the authenticity or significance of His acts, but with that primal question with which He is Himself recorded to have confronted His own generation, 'What think ye of the Christ? Whose son is He?'

I omit—it is not really relevant to my argument—the further survey of the other lines of interpretation which have come to us who as scholars of the New Testament are trying to understand Jesus. In this audience it is hardly necessary to refer to the point of view of those who would set Him not against a Jewish background, but against a background of the Graeco-Oriental mystery religions; nor is it necessary to do more than allude to

those Christian scholars of the last few years who, following up the clue that it is His person and not His teaching which is of importance, have drawn attention, like my friend Dr. Cairns, to His works of power, or who, as Sir Edwin Hoskyns has lately done, have drawn attention to the primitive character of the claim that He was the Son of God.

I have suggested that so far as critical studies are concerned, we have come to see, very largely under the influence and with the help of Jewish scholars, that when we have tried to classify Jesus under the categories of prophet or teacher, those categories do not, in fact, explain His influence. He breaks through that kind of definition. If we would explain that which flowed from Him, we have to look to something, may I say, less conventional, less ordinary, less human.

That is the first section of the argument I want to bring before you.

Simultaneously with this change, drawing attention to the importance of the person of Jesus, comes a change in the general philosophy of our time, a change which I need not elaborate at length, for it is familiar to everyone in this audience. In the last ten years nothing has been more striking than the revolt against mechanical, mathematical concepts of reality. That is partly, of course, simply one expression of the general revolt of mankind at this time against the domination of the machine. I suppose that the secret of our unhappiness in the industrial world is more largely due to the threat to personality involved in the standardizing, the Ford-izing of industry, and the consequent fear that mankind will be turned into a sort of animated robot, than to any other single issue. It seems to me that the new revolt in the arts, the new painting, the new sculpture, the new music, the new poetry—modernisms which I am far too old-fashioned to understand or appreciate—are a protest against the standardized, the conventional, the legal, in favour of life and movement and personality. And I think the same is largely true of the revolt in the moral sphere, this revolt against authority, whether ethical or ecclesiastical, this revolt which has had many rather shocking consequences in the eyes at least of the older ones among us, and yet surely is a protest on behalf of personality, the rights of persons as against abstract principles.

The same thing, of course, is true in philosophy. Philosophy is in a state of the most extraordinary chaos at the moment, but if there is any discernible movement, it is a movement against those concepts of the value of analysis which have dominated human thinking since Descartes. You see my point. We have come to see that you cannot explain the whole in terms of a selected number of its parts, that you cannot explain the wholeness of the whole—if I may use a clumsy phrase—in terms of the sum of its parts, that all these attempts to explain mankind in terms of chemistry or physics—yes, or in terms of biology or analytical psychology—do involve the fallacy of assuming that the analysed elements are original, and that the whole from which they have been analysed is only the product of them. We have come to see the wholeness of personality. Personality, more than art or philosophy or even what I may call activity, represents the highest thing in the universe.

You will ask what bearing this has upon my theme. It has this bearing. Dr. Herford—I think it is—in contrasting Christianity with Judaism, says that Judaism is a religion of ideas and Christianity a religion of a person. I think that point of view will be accepted by the majority of Jewish scholars; and I can only suggest that the contrast is less satisfactory to them at this time when we have come to see that ideas are, after all, secondary to persons, when we have come to feel that personality is too complete and too unanalysible an entity to be expressed in terms of ideas, and when we are, therefore, ready to believe that the best interpretation of the infinite, the best interpretation of God that we can find, will not be in terms of ideas but in terms of the person.

If, on the one side, as the result of our critical studies, we have come to see more and more clearly the importance of the person of Jesus, the movement in philosophy, unless I misunderstand it, has made it more and more obvious that if we can find the eternal God anywhere it will not be in any category lower than a person that we shall discover Him, that the belief which we call the belief in the Incarnation is not so incompatible, as has sometimes in the past appeared, with a sound philosophical outlook, that, in fact, for us men and women, using the personality of men and women as our medium of apprehension,

it is in terms of that personality that the real will come most plainly to us.

Those are the two points which I want to make before you as determining in my judgment the outlook of Christians upon Jesus in these days. I should say that they have come to feel more and more plainly the quality of His person, a quality which must be sufficient to explain the immense change which has flowed from His life and work in the world, and that, recognizing the importance of the quality of His person, they have come to see again that if they would have any clear vision of the Most High God they need not be ashamed to look for that vision in His most perfect human image.

Now, you ask, what is the bearing of that upon general Christian thought in these days? There I can only speak very briefly and more than usually for myself, because my fellow-Christians will very likely not agree with the standpoint which I shall take. My own conviction is this, that the development of thought in recent times about Jesus among Christians is pointing more and more clearly to the adequacy of the interpretation of Jesus which we find in the Fourth Gospel. I am not going to enter upon the enormously vexed question of the historicity or otherwise of that Gospel; for my present contention it matters nothing whether it is in any sense a historical record or the musings and meditations of a later Christian disciple. The significance is in the attempt which that Gospel makes to describe Jesus, not in terms of teacher or wonder-worker, not in terms of any particular attribute of His human genius, but in terms appropriate to religion, appropriate to personality, in terms of light which is vision, of life which is sensitiveness, and of love which is creative sympathy. I think that Christian thinking, whatever conclusion it forms about the historicity of that gospel, more plainly now than at any time in the past, finds its study of Jesus pointing towards the sort of portrait that the fourth evangelist gives.

You ask how that conception of Jesus bears upon our view of God. Here again I speak with diffidence and for myself. I should say that the last few years have seen a very marked reaction in Christian circles away from that view of the doctrine of the Trinity which emphasizes the separateness of three Per-

sons, and towards the point of view of the doctrine which we believe to be nearer to that of the original formulators of the Nicene Creed. The Fathers who drew up the Nicene Creed, remember, were concerned not to assert Trinitarianism, but to defend the unity of the Godhead. They were concerned to defend that unity as manifested not in three personal Beings, but in three aspects or modes. That is plain scholarship. It may be that their definition was inadequate, but that is, in fact, what the Nicene Creed originally set itself to do, to assert that in Jesus was manifested the very self of God, a true portrait, that He was not a sort of intermediary, displaying neither Godhead nor manhood in its fullness, but that as man He expressed and was that very element or aspect of the Divine Being to which His disciples had come to give the name the Son of God.

Now, I do not know how far the conviction that Christian thought is moving along that line to a full recognition that for us human beings Jesus is the unique manifestation, the incarnation of Deity, verily and in effect one in the quality of His being with the Eternal God, will be regarded by my Christian co-religionists as adequate for their orthodoxy, nor how far it will be regarded by you of the Jewish faith as challenging your own convictions.

With this last word I will conclude. Taking that as a general estimate of the Christian outlook of this present time, it is still quite evident that within the ranks of those who share that estimate there are two main types of religious experience. There are those whose religion is frankly and wholly Christ-centred, whose whole concept of God is of God in Christ, for whom what they know and see of Jesus fills and more than fills all that they can imagine of the beauty and the truth and the goodness which they associate with Deity, and whose religious experience is essentially similar to that of St. Paul, an experience of life in Christ, of the living Christ and of communion with Him. Then there is another type of experience which I for one would not regard as in any sense less Christian, for whom Christ is essentially the way to the Father—more indeed than the herald of the Kingdom or the preacher of God, more than a prophet of the Most High, but one who has created for His followers a new and fuller and more adequate concept of the Eternal. For

people of that type, religious experience is essentially a communion not with Christ but with God, with God whose nature and quality are illuminated by the teaching and example of Christ, an experience which lays larger stress than the other type would do upon those other manifestations of God in Nature and in the non-Christian world.

Of those two types, it seems to me that the second does not come very far away from that which I read in the writings of Liberal Jews, and it seems to me, recognizing that second type as fully entitled to call itself and to be acclaimed as Christian, that on the basis of that recognition we come very close to the mind and outlook, to the essential experience, of many of my Jewish friends. But that, after all, is for you to discuss and decide. I only want to close by saying, as I said at the beginning, that I am not in the least fit to do justice to the theme on which you have asked me to speak, but I have tried to set out certain tendencies in the Christian thinking of the last twenty or thirty years and to point out that those tendencies, while on the one side they certainly give Jesus at once a more central and a more exalted place than some critical scholarship in the past would be able to do, yet seem to me to link up in experience with a type of religion not very far removed from any section in this audience.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AS SEEN BY A FORMER ROMAN CATHOLIC

AMONGST the problems of the religious world at the present time, one of the most interesting is that of the mission of the Church of England in the development of Christianity. This article will attempt to give an estimate of that problem from the point of view of one who formerly was a member of the Roman Catholic Church.

Such a person will retain upon his mind the impression derived from the Roman conception of the Church: a conception of which the chief features are authority and unity both in government and in doctrine. In the words of the celebrated Jesuit theologian, Perrone (*Praelectiones Theologicae*, ii, 62):

'*Unitas Ecclesiae in Scripturis constanter praedicatur. Christus enim vocat Ecclesiam regnum suum, ovile, domum, Ecclesiam Suam semper in singulari numero; Apostolus vero passim Christi Ecclesiam vocat corpus Christi, quod certe nonnisi unum esse potest.*' Or, as expressed in Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary* (ed. 1917, pp. 178-9): 'Let sects increase ever so much, and spread and flourish in human estimation, still the Church remained the bride of Christ and the sole heir to His promises. To each new sect the Church could say, "*Prior veni:* I was here before you: I, not you, have received the commission to teach and rule the nations." Another gift was necessary, without which the Church's unity could not have continued, and even if it could have been maintained, would have been an evil rather than a blessing. There is no real advantage in an iron constraint which forces men to repeat the same formulas and acquiesce in the same decisions; there is no advantage in unity, unless it be unity in the truth. Accordingly, our Lord made His Church infallible.'

The objections to this theory need not be gone into here, as this article is not a controversial essay on the Roman Catholic Church. Were the article that, many objections would at once arise. For example, it is a plain historical fact that 'iron constraint, forcing men to repeat the same formulas and acquiesce in the same decisions,' has been a great factor in the growth of the Roman Church, while the exact nature of that Church's own supposed infallibility was for ages undefined; indeed, even the definition made at the Vatican Council of 1870 only *seems* precise, and is not really so: for theologians have various views as to what the crucial phrase '*ex cathedrâ*' implies. Words of the late Bishop Gore (*R.C. Claims*, 10th ed., pp. 29-30) occur to one as expressing another idea of Christian unity:

> 'All Christians who believe in a visible Church must admit that there have been times when the Church has been extraordinarily corrupt without losing that intrinsic holiness which belongs to her, because she has the Holy Spirit within her . . . In the same way the divisions in the Church prevent her from bearing the witness she ought to bear to the one life by which she lives; but she no more ceases to be "one" by outward divisions, than she ceases to be "holy" by tolerating sin . . . *Primarily,* the unity of the Church is in Scripture a unity of inward life.'

However, it will be realised that one who has been a member of the Roman Catholic Church, and leaves it to join the Anglican, enters an altogether different atmosphere from that which he left. He sees many things in a light very different from that in which it is seen by those who always have been Anglicans. For example, the extreme 'High Church' or advanced Anglo-Catholic party is viewed in a light quite other by a Roman Catholic, or by one who has been a Roman Catholic, than by the adherents themselves of that party, or even by their opponents in the Anglican Church. The advanced High Churchmen themselves entertain the idea that in their doctrines and practices they are *more Catholic* than other Anglicans; and their opponents regard them as *approximating to Rome*. Surely, however, the view taken by Rome herself, in such a matter, is of some importance.

The Papacy—by the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* of Pope Leo XIII in 1896—has declared that the ordinations of the Anglican clergy are 'absolutely null and utterly void.' That is to say, the Anglican body does not possess even the elementary factors necessary to constitute a Church at all; her clergy are not clergy, her sacraments (except baptism and matrimony, which do not absolutely need clergy for their validity) are not sacraments; she is, in short, from the ecclesiastical point of view, *nothing*. However some of her ministers may teach 'Catholic doctrine'; however they may simulate the rites of 'Catholicism'—all is empty. They are no more really Catholics (in the eyes of Rome) than Abou Hassan—with the dressing up of whom, in the Arabian tale, Haroun Al Raschid amused himself—was really the Caliph. '"So," said he to himself, "I am Caliph! But," added he, recollecting himself, "it is only a dream."' The operation of that disillusionment has been described vividly by John Henry Newman in the *Apologia*:

> 'That it [the Anglican Church] is something sacred, that it is an oracle of revealed doctrine, that it can claim a share in St. Ignatius or St. Cyprian, that it can take the rank, contest the teaching, and stop the path of the Church of St. Peter, that it can call itself "the Bride of the Lamb": this is the view of it which simply disappeared from my mind on my conversion, and which it would be almost a miracle to reproduce. "I went by, and lo! it was gone; I sought it, but its place could nowhere be found'; and nothing can bring it back to me. And, as to its possession of an episcopal succession from the time of the

> Apostles, well, it may have it, and, if the Holy See ever so decide, I will believe it, as being the decision of a higher judgment than my own [The Holy See, of course, afterwards decided "it had it" not]: but, for myself, I must have St. Philip's gift, who saw the sacredotal character on the forehead of a gaily-attired youngster, before I can by my own wit acquiesce in it: for antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts.'

This is an accurate account of how Rome and Roman Catholics view even the 'Highest' of Anglicans; they are aware of the high doctrine which is taught, and the elaborate ceremonial which is used, by the advanced Anglo-Catholic party, but these do not impress Roman Catholics, who take the view that such things no more, in themselves, make a Catholic than uniform and an imperious voice made the 'cobbler of Köpernick' a captain.

However, it may be suggested that that is the view only of persons actually Roman Catholics, and that those who once were so and are not so now may take another view. Such is partly the case, but by no means wholly so. If one does not accept without question the decisions of the Papacy on controversial questions, one may accept the validity of Anglican ordinations although the Papacy has condemned them: but in what sense can one accept them?

Granting the assumptions on which it was based, the condemnation, by Leo XIII, of the Anglican ordinations seems unanswerable. The essential of those assumptions was (to quote Leo's Bull) this: 'From [the Anglican rite of ordination] was deliberately removed [by the Reformers who compiled it] whatever sets forth the dignity and office of the priesthood.' By the priesthood Rome understands ordination enabling the ordained person to offer up the Mass as a real Sacrifice, and, in so doing, to bring about the supreme miracle of Transubstantiation. That Anglican ordinations are incapable of this (even if in reality any ordinations are) is a simply provable fact. When the Reformers compiled the new Anglican Ordinal, they eliminated all that expressed capability of conveying such power. To quote an able writer (Estcourt, *Anglican Ordinations*, pp. 268-70):

> 'The continual sacrifice was taken away, and thenceforward a change was made in the rite of ordination of priests by removing everything that expressed the power of sacrifice, and substituting instead the duty of teaching and administering sacraments . . . There is no mention of "offering and consecrating" among the functions of a

> priest; but his duty is described under a variety of terms, which go no further than the idea of teaching in one form or another . . . Everything that expresses sacrifice or sacerdotal functions is expunged.'

The sense, then, in which Anglican orders may be accepted as valid must be a sense other than that of a sacrificing priesthood. 'Ruling, preaching or teaching, and the administration of the Sacraments, together with the general conduct of public worship, form' (to quote Archdeacon Paige Cox, *The Church of England as Catholic and Reformed*, p. 141) 'a triplet of presbyteral functions corresponding to Christ's threefold work on behalf of His people as Prophet, Priest and King. As Ministers of Christ, the presbyters represent Him in this threefold capacity in the three main departments of their work.' But, in view of the proved facts of the action taken at the Reformation, this must be understood in a sense quite different from that of 'Rome.' These advanced Anglo-Catholics, then, who would place the Anglican Church on a basis similar to what is understood as Catholic by the Latin Church, or to what was understood as Catholic by the English Church before the Reformation, are cherishing a vain dream.

> 'Archbishop Parker, and those who coincided with him in seeking the reformation of the Church, regarded themselves as persons representing, and called upon to govern, the old Catholic Church of this realm into which they had been baptised, and this—the old Catholic Church—they never quitted. In the Middle Ages corruptions of doctrine and discipline gradually had been introduced, . . . and they felt it their duty to . . . bring it [the English Church] back to primitive truth,'[1]

An able Roman Catholic writer (the late Dr. Adrian Fortescue, *The Early Papacy*, 1920, p. 61) said: 'There are fewer difficulties [in regard to historical evidence] against the Papacy than against most articles of the Catholic faith.' I would accept that statement in this sense: I cannot see how a person who regards the Sacrifice of the Mass, and Transubstantiation, as articles of faith can reject Papal Supremacy and Infallibility. All these doctrines are equally parts of one process of development in the Western Church, and, if we include both the Eastern Orthodox and the Anglican Churches, then neither of the first two of the before-mentioned doctrines is an article of Catholic faith: for certainly they are not so in the formularies of the

[1] *Epitome of Anglican Church History*, by Ellen Webley-Parry, p. 267.

Anglican Church, and therefore—on any principle of 'Catholic consent' which shall include the Anglican Church—there is lacking, in these two crucial matters, the necessary factors to produce such consent. In short, from any possible Anglican point of view, the doctrines of Transubstantiation and the Mass cannot be regarded as parts of the Christian faith. Such Anglicans as favour them should join the Roman Catholic Church, wherein there is a logical, intelligible line of development which includes those doctrines. It is impossible to defend the Anglican Church except frankly as a Reformed Church which definitely rejects doctrines such as those of a sacrificing priesthood and the Mass.

In what sense, however, are we to understand the reformed character of the English Church? There is a school of conservative Protestantism in the Church of England which apparently would regard the settlement made in the sixteenth century as the final standard, and would judge everything by reference to it as a Roman Catholic theologian would judge everything by reference to the infallible decrees of Trent or some other Council. How can such an attitude logically be defended in the Anglican Church? For one thing, it overlooks the *continuity* of that Church.

From the point of view of the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England possesses no religious continuity with the pre-Reformation *Ecclesia Anglicana*. This is emphatically asserted by Cardinal Bourne:

> 'We have said elsewhere, and we repeat now, that no one who really has studied and understood the history of these martyrs [the Roman Catholics executed during the reign of Queen Elizabeth] can maintain honestly that there is any real *continuity of doctrine, worship and discipline* between the Elizabethan Church, still legally established in this country, and the Catholic Church set up among us by St. Augustine in 597, and of which we [Roman] Catholics, in union with the Apostolic See, are the sole legitimate representatives to-day . . . Thus did the Elizabethan Church begin by deliberately severing itself from the ecclesiastical hierarchy which, set up by the Holy Roman See, had existed in this country from the days of St. Augustine of Canterbury . . . This and this alone [*i.e.*, by the setting up of a new hierarchy, "devoid of any ecclesiastical sanction," by Elizabeth] is the origin of the present Church of England, wholly distinct and dissevered from the old *Ecclesia Anglicana*, or Catholic Church in England, for nigh a thousand years one of the glories of the Western Church.'[2]

[2] Cardinal Bourne, R.C. Archbishop of Westminster, Lenten Pastoral for 1928, on *The Creation of the Elizabethan Church*, pp. 5, 10—11.

I do not see how this can be denied on the basis of any theory which takes the Mass, and associated conceptions of the priesthood, as the true doctrine of the Church. To quote an able Roman Catholic writer (Dom Norbert Birt, O.S.B., *The Line of Cleavage under Elizabeth*, Catholic Truth Society, 1929, p. 25): 'In that part of the Prayer Book representing the Mass and Eucharistic Liturgy, every mention of "Victim" or "Host," "Oblation" or "Sacrifice" (except "sacrifice of praise"), was purposely and sedulously left out . . . It is not necessary to do more than consult Missal and Prayer Book side by side, to reassure yourselves that in the First Prayer Book there occur no less than sixteen places where whatever words or phrases indicated the doctrine of sacrifice and of a real and objective presence were carefully expunged. And in the Second Prayer Book, nine futher alterations were made in passages inadvertently retained which were found to bear a shadow of resemblance to Catholic teaching . . . Bishop Hall could say: "The Book of Common Prayer was not taken from the Mass, but the Mass was eliminated from the Book of Common Prayer."'

If any conception of the Church, at all akin to that of Rome, is true, how can the present Church of England be in continuity with that existing previous to the Reformation?

On the other hand, continuity would exist if that conception of the Church be not correct, and if the true conception is one in which the Mass, and associated sacerdotalism, are not articles of the faith. If those tenets are regarded as accretions on an earlier and purer doctrine, then giving them up would not destroy the continuity of a church. On that assumption Anglican continuity can be defended: but not on a theory which includes mediaeval sacerdotalism as an essential of the church's life. If the latter is true, ecclesiastical continuity does not rest with the present Church of England, but with those who refused to conform to the Reformation; *i.e.*, with the Roman Catholics of England. If, on the other hand, the conceptions expressed by mediaeval sacerdotalism were merely accretions, an ecclesiastical continuity can be vindicated for the present Church of England: the continuity, that is, of a body which dates back to ancient times, was for ages overspread by doctrinal and governmental accretions, but eventually was freed therefrom whilst retaining the essentials of its constitution. In short, no continuity can be vindicated for the present Church of England except a continuity which does not regard sacerdotalism as an essential to the Church.

Such a form of non-sacerdotal continuity being granted, however, light is cast upon the true nature of the Reformation. It being granted that the Church of England is an ancient body going back to earliest times, and which in the course of its history has passed through, for example, a change so great as the Reformation (when beliefs and practices so far-reaching were revised), then it follows that *the formularies of the Church of England cannot be taken in any too definitely fixed a sense.* Great revisions have occurred before; revisions must be possible again. Therefore the school of Protestants which would regard the formularies of the sixteenth century as sacrosanct is wrong. It attaches too great a degree of fixity to the standards of one age of a Church which has seen many changes.

Take the case of the Thirty-nine Articles. 'In the sixteenth century,' said the late Canon Frederick Meyrick (*Protestant Dictionary*, 1904, p. 43),

> 'the different reformed Churches were charged by their Papal opponents with being solely destructive and having no positive faith of their own. To obviate this calumny and to give stability to their own members, who might easily be carried too far in their hostility to "Popery," each put forward its Confession of Faith . . . Just as Lutherans are bound by the Augsburg Confession and Romanists by the Tridentine Confession, embodied in the so-called Creed of Pope Pius IV, so Anglican Churchmen are bound by the XXXIX Articles, which are their Church's Confession of Faith.'

Some qualifications need to be made in this generally accurate statement. The Reformed Churches cannot regard their Confessions of Faith in the same light as the Roman Catholic Church regards hers. The latter Church regards itself as the Sole, Infallible Church of Christ: not as one Church amongst others. The Decree on Opening of the Council of Trent said:

> 'Doth it please you unto the praise and glory of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost; for the increase and exaltation of the Christian faith and religion; for the extirpation of heresies; for the peace and union of the Church; for the reformation of the clergy and Christian people; for the depression and extinction of the enemies of the Christian name—to decree and declare that the sacred and general Council of Trent do begin, and hath begun?' They answered: "It pleaseth us."'

Here we have the idea of a magisterial synod of a Church which looks on all others as heretics, and on itself as the One Ark of Salvation, its decrees being infallible. The Confessions of Faith of the Reformed Churches are based on no similar belief

as to themselves or the Churches making them. Further, Rome regards her decrees on faith, once made, as being for ever unalterable. No Reformed Church logically can advance a similar claim, and in the case of the Church of England, even more than other Reformed Churches, fixity is certainly no part of its Reformation. 'In the Articles,' said the late Charles Beard, a non-Anglican but impartial student (*The Reformation in Relation to Modern Thought and Knowledge*, 1883, pp. 324-5).

> 'We find a confession of faith in closest relation to the Confession of Augsburg, and which in contents and in history alike takes its place among the symbolic documents of the Reformation. On one side we have the national character of the movement, the theoretical continuity of the Church of England, the uninterrupted episcopal succession, the prayer-book drawn from mediaeval sources [but *cf.* the remarks, above, on how the latter two facts must be taken only in a sense apart from some leading mediaeval doctrines], the Catholic preferences of Henry and Elizabeth, the Anglican churchmanship of Parker: on the other, the light kindled from Wittenberg, the popular revolt against superstition and abuse, the doctrinal Protestantism of the Universities, the influence of Cranmer's foreign advisers, the Calvinistic zeal of the Marian exiles, the enthusiasm of a newly acquired faith, which was careless of old usage, and did not fear to contemplate revolution. These were the forces which Elizabeth sought to compel to live together on terms prescribed by the Prayer-book of 1559 and the Articles of 1563. How premature the compromise was, the history of every subsequent century sufficiently shows.'

In short, the Articles, Prayer Book and other elements of the constitution of the Anglican Church cannot be regarded as fixed and sacrosanct. They belong to a Church which (granting it an ancient continuity) has seen great changes in itself: and, indeed, they were products of one series of such changes. They must be capable of revision if good reason exists for such revision.

Here an important question arises. If Anglican formularies are liable to revision, could they not be revised so as to restore all the mediaeval doctrines and practices rejected by the Reformers in the sixteenth century? That fear, in fact, is at the back of Protestant conservatism about Articles and Prayer Book; and the activities of advanced Anglo-Catholics make it plausible. Yet it is a fallacy.

Mediaeval doctrines like the Mass, Transubstantiation and a mediatorial sacerdotalism (let alone Papal supremacy) are doctrines which have no meaning except as binding articles of

faith. They cannot be simply doctrines which a Church permits its members to hold or not as they please. A Church in which they are recognized must be one in which they are looked on as binding on all. By rejecting them, then, the reformed Church of England declared finally that they are not articles of faith. Therefore they are not capable of being restored in the Church of England except by a complete revolution. They do not come within the scope of any revision of formularies. A school of extreme Anglo-Catholics may think they do: but they are mistaken. (Of course, adoption of more beautiful ceremonial, if clearly distinct from doctrine finally abandoned, is another thing.) Attempts to force mediaevalism into an un-mediaeval Church can end only, if carried far enough, in disruption and ecclesiastical revolution. The constitution of the Church of England is flexible and mutable: but it is not consistent with mediaevalism. (I do not use this word necessarily as a term of reproach, but as descriptive of a system which, whether good or otherwise, the Church of England definitely abandoned.)

The late Rev. Alfred Fawkes said (*The Genius of the English Church*, pp. 99, 103, 109-10):

> 'In estimating the forces of progress it is difficult to strike a balance between past and present. There is more of what is called Liberalism in the Church and among the clergy than there was a generation ago; on the other hand, the public opinion which stood behind the older Liberalism, and gave men like Stanley and Jowett an assured position, has to a great extent disappeared. [These words, written in 1917, seem to have been an exaggeration even then, and require much qualification] . . . Perhaps the most hopeful feature in the present situation is the sense of social and economic readjustment that is in the air . . . The larger call is in her [the English Church's] ears: she may hear it, and follow; or she may be deaf to it, and refrain. In other words, she may resign herself to the distinctive and denominational position of a mere Anglicanism, or she may rise to her higher calling, and stand for English Christianity as a whole . . . In the [latter] case, a great, a very great, destiny awaits her.'

To the writer of this article the problem seems to come to this: If the true idea of Christianity is that of an authoritative, sacerdotal Church, the duty is to join (or, if one has left it, to rejoin) the Roman Catholic Church, in which alone that idea is logically developed; but as to the Church of England, its genius is different—that of expressing broad religious ideas in a progressive spirit.

J. W. Poynter.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE GUIDANCE OF GOD

By R. C. Blumer, M.A.,
Vice-Principal of Achimota College, Accra, West Africa.

WE are accustomed to say that if we seek God humbly and simply in prayer He will guide us and show us His will. But many of us, though we have been brought up to believe this, do not find it so easy to gain God's guidance, and perhaps have a lurking suspicion that there must be something wrong with ourselves, or something wrong with such a simple statement of the case.

One old idea of guidance was that a man must accept the judgment of society in all matters. Such judgment was to be found in a meticulous code; for instance, the Law of Moses for later Judaism. A man had no right to question such a law; that would be blasphemous. And he had no need to think out the general principles and apply them in special cases; that was done for him. The students and administrators of the law had applied it to every conceivable situation in life. With such a law you were safe, and your only responsibility was to obey without question.

Jesus was killed because He did question this position. He dared to claim that the individual judgment of man, enlightened by the Spirit of God, was competent to judge of the merits and the meaning of such an ineffably sacred institution as the Sabbath, the sacrifices in the Temple, or the law about clean and unclean meats. He knew that God had enabled Him to see more of the truth about these things than was embodied in the law; and He knew that it was possible for other men also to come to see the truth as clearly. He taught that the children of God were not like slaves to be governed by prison regulations. They were sons, who, like their Father, were qualified to decide and to judge for themselves. St. Paul fought the same battle, and won the battle and lost his life. In his letter to the Galatians we are shown how he won the victory for all time in this respect at least: in that he freed Christianity from the domination of the

Jewish law, which threatened to strangle it, he made it possible for Christians to fight the same battle again and win it whenever need arises. Christ and Paul won a victory for the freedom of mind and conscience. They showed that as children of the light it is possible and right for us—it is our duty—to be guided directly by God. Our own individual judgment must have the last word—even to the extent of judging the teaching of Christ Himself—however sacred, however universally believed, however long established be the authority which would dictate to us. But here is our first complication.

We are in these days coming to realize, to our great amazement, that we have exploded the old superstitions of an infallible Church, and infallible book, and all other infallible external guides. Yet did not Christ and Paul explode these same superstitions of external authority two thousand years ago? Who has gathered the bits and put them together once more, that it has been necessary for us to stage this beautiful explosion all over again? The truth is there is always a tendency, when we are freed from the bonds of authority, to fall back into some new bondage, to seek new fetters for our minds. Paul noticed with amazement that his Galatian friends, who had been freed from the bondage of their old pagan beliefs, yet looked for a new bondage, that of the Jewish law. Freedom is much too difficult a thing for most of us.

There is a second complication in the apparently simple matter of the guidance of God. God guides those who seek Him humbly in prayer. That is a theory built on experience. But when we come to put this theory to the test by further experience some extremely awkward facts come to light. Devout and honest and godly people are often guided in opposite ways in the same matter. And some of them are guided in very terrible ways. Torquemada and Bloody Mary were most devout and humble souls, and they both believed that they were led by the guidance of God to do the things that have made their names abhorred. Saul of Tarsus verily believed that it was his duty to slay the Christians. Terrible crimes have been committed in the name of religion, and perhaps the most terrible of all by those who were most honest and devout. God does not guide people to do such things; and the theory of an infallible inner

guidance from God cannot be true in its crude form. Further, this theory is inclined to assume that God always gives us His guidance through *a feeling of guidance*. He does not. A feeling of guidance is one thing; but the guidance of God may be another. God can indeed guide us by a sort of special intuitive illumination, as witness the mystics, but that is not His ordinary way of leading them or us. He has to build up our lives on a sounder foundation than that. We must reckon it as another of the superstitions that divine guidance is always or generally given through a sort of special light that takes possession of a man and carries him away. It is not nearly so simple a matter.

Yet difficult as may be a life lived under guidance of God, once we have thrown off, in its name, absolute laws and institutions, we dare not shirk the difficulty. There is a terrible danger that we may accept the new freedom, but because it is so difficult to gain God's guidance try to do without it altogether. We may throw off the old yoke, and put nothing in its place. It is easy to forget the danger of dropping accustomed restraints; the responsibility we are assuming in taking it, ultimately, upon ourselves to decide what is right. In a sense we take on nothing less than the task of God Himself; to know, to understand, and to love what is good. We need the mind of God Himself to do it truly.

We are gradually coming to understand and to master the laws and the forces of nature. But sometimes we make mistakes. Our control relaxes; and these mighty forces turn and rend us, and show us how far we have still to go in the way of understanding and mastery. In the moral adventure, the higher we go, the more freedom and responsibility we assume, the greater the degradation and disaster if we fail. It follows that the more thorough and disciplined our study of the truth must be, the more single-minded must we become. St. Paul himself was so dazzlingly single-minded that right decision was straightforward to him, and he was hardly in a position to see all its difficulties for others. If we throw off the restraints of old conventions and codes, and undertake this new quest, not solemnly and thoughtfully, and with humility and fear, but lightly, merely rejoicing in our freedom from restraint, then we are laying ourselves open to the influences of every wave of passion and pre-

judice, to every new fad and superstition and craze. The extremes in some modern experiments in art and morals are largely due to the fact that the restraint of old conventions has not been replaced by any patient and systematic and disciplined search for beauty and truth. Liberty without a guiding light and without discipline from within becomes libertinism. It seems wise, then, to affirm that whenever we make a decision which contradicts the time-honoured opinions of the Church, or of some other society, the responsibility is laid upon us to show on what grounds we have cast over the judgment of man's past experience.

To put the matter in a word, God cannot give us His own judgment and wisdom all at once. We must have training which shall make us sensitive to values. We must learn to see what is good, and we must acquire the power to work for it. God Himself must train our taste and our strength and our skill. It is not merely a matter of His taking us by the hand and leading us through the dark. We must learn, and perhaps slowly, to walk in the light. God has provided for this. There is no part of creation and of our life in which He does not reveal Himself. He reveals Himself in the sunrise, and the rapid tropical growth of plants; in the skill of painters and workers in metal; in the miracle of a petrol engine, or the miracle of the birth of a baby; in that insight into the spirit of another person which comes from close personal relationship; in worship; in faithful work day by day; in the exhilaration of exercise. God reveals Himself in all these ways. Through them He shows us His nature and His character; the things that are worth working for; the ultimate principles of existence. In them we see God in action, and so we learn what He is like. And as they are part of His scheme for our guidance, so we cannot afford to neglect them. If God reveals part of His character through the facts that science has discovered about sex or about the growth of the mind of a child, then we cannot pretend to be in earnest in desiring God's guidance if we ignore these facts.

Yet true education lies not only in *learning*, but also in *doing*. In a school pupils are given 'guidance' not only, or chiefly, through sermons and lessons, but also through all the training in the classroom: in house and garden work; in handi-

crafts; in sports; in social service. By these they acquire both a foundation of solid information and practical training in discerning and doing what is useful and good. So God does by us. He guides by light from all His creation, but He guides us also *by what He gives us to do.*

In many cases our eye has to be trained to see what is good, and to train our eye or our ear it is often necessary that we should work; that we should learn to create beautiful things. Working at what is good will generally show us its goodness. Sometimes two people love one another in a flash, but more often not. I am sure that the Good Samaritan found the naked Jew, wallowing in his blood by the roadside, a repulsive sight. But he worked for him, not because he loved him, but because he knew in his mind he ought to; and he ended by loving him exceedingly. I think that we must recognize this quite clearly as a principle of life; that just as we often cannot see the goodness or beauty in persons or things till we have learnt to do so, often we cannot so learn till we work with good men or for fine things. No one will claim that the mobs who watched and applauded the courage of the gladiators became thereby any more courageous themselves. They became less, because they accustomed themselves to seeing and applauding and there resting content. And so in our worship, if we are content to revel in our adoration of God and do nothing to show forth that adoration in practical living, then we do not come closer to Him by our worship. Rather we become less like Him and further from Him.

God guides us, then, by revelation through His creation and through our work. It follows that discipline must play a large part in our lives; continuous self-discipline; and our family life and our business life are essential factors in God's guidance.

From what we have said so far it might appear that God is unable to guide us till we are altogether like Him; which would mean that He could never really guide us at all in this life. But of course that is not true. It is a question of degree. It is possible for God to guide us when we are yet ignorant and blind and weak, and while our tastes are still untrained and our powers undeveloped. Such guidance and our ensuing conduct will naturally be of little significance to the world at large, which needs adult sons of God, but it will be of vital importance to us

in our own stage of development. If we are in the habit of seeking God's presence quietly in prayer, and remembering the many ways in which He reveals what is good and beautiful in His eyes, then this constantly being in His presence will of itself produce a change in us and a growth. We shall be guided because we shall be unconsciously receiving His mind and His spirit.

There is another way in which God can affect our whole life from the beginning. Have you ever seen a young man, ignorant and light-hearted, with no serious interests, cheerfully and feebly fooling his way through life, suddenly wakened up by falling in love or by the inspiration given by some great man or by the vision of some great work? He is pulled up with a jerk. A new interest and guiding principle has entered his life. It steadies him and turns him in one direction. He becomes single-minded; he sets himself to live in earnest; he grows almost by leaps and bounds. We all have tremendous powers in us, and what they need is a great and guiding interest to harness them and turn them in one definite direction. We call it conversion when the new dominating interest is Christ or God: when we turn to God, and surrender ourselves to Him, and so make it possible for Him to guide us. That is sound psychology, a matter of experience, which has been proved in a countless number of lives. In practice the greatest guiding and driving force is personal devotion; either devotion to some one person, be it God or man, or a more general devotion to a group, by reason of our love for them and our knowledge of their needs — a passion for souls. God is seen in all His works; in nature and in art and in science and in history and in religion; but in the knowledge of persons and in religion we have a special light, a throbbing and vital insight into truth. By serving and knowing one another we come to love one another; and love teaches us more about man and life than any other single source of light whatever. If we have devotion to the unseen God — to the living Christ — that is the most excellent way. And our interest in one another, our knowledge of one another, entering into one another's joys and difficulties, is the logical—I might almost say the biological—and the most fruitful source of devotion to God. I think it is impossible to emphasize this too much. We are living spirits; and

our knowledge of one another is the centre and inspiration of all other realms of knowledge whatever. We sometimes talk about goodness and truth and beauty as the ultimate values, but we have gained our exalted conception of these values because man has discovered by experience that such qualities elicit a response from his nature; and as that is the origin of our veneration of them, so it follows that we shall understand them the better the more we know of ourselves and of one another. These values have the power to inspire and dominate us when we see them personified and made living in men. Which brings us to the supreme example of how God has revealed Himself through Jesus Christ His Son. God is our Father, and through this living image of Himself we shall best see and love Him, best learn to be guided by Him.

We must pray and seek for guidance; but we must pray with our minds as well as our hearts, and our wills must be ready to obey. We must seek to know God in all the ways in which He reveals Himself, and think of these things when we pray. And the result of our prayer will be this, that when we have to make a decision God will guide us through our ordinary common sense. He guides us while we are still weak and blind, if we but surrender to Him and follow the little light we have. He guides us by the knowledge of Himself that comes from serving and loving one another. He guides us supremely in His response to our devotion to Him, and ultimately into all truth, to which we shall attain when we have attained to the mind of God.

BOOK REVIEWS

A CONSTRUCTIVE ICONOCLAST*

Mr. Hardwick is an iconoclast. About that there is no doubt. In the volume which he has contributed to *The Modernist Series* he sets about smashing the idols of conventional ecclesiasticism, and he does so with an exhilarating zest. Some of his readers will, no doubt, find his attitude towards established institutions so unsympathetic that, as he himself suggests, they may be tempted to fling the book into the fire. They would be ill-advised to do anything of the sort, for the trenchancy of his criticism of the Church as it is, is but the measure of the intensity of his positive vision of the Church as it should be. His destructive criticism stands out against a background of a constructive ideal. He sees a Church which shall be a fit home for religious genius, and, while guarding faithfully the contributions of the religious insight of the past, shall provide encouragement for those who in the future may be able to add to its heritage. Its function will be to create as well as to preserve, and this it will do by breeding creative individualists. 'Churches must find a place within their borders for men and women of original ideas and independent behaviour.' 'In an age of increasing mechanization and standardization churches should be little enclaves for the encouragement of personal freedom and spontaneity, in thought, in conduct, and in general attitude to life.'

In Mr. Hardwick's view, revelation is essentially a function of individual religious genius:

> 'The only supernatural revelation in which I have any belief is the inspiration of the individual genius, and I believe that in religion, as well as in art and science, it is the individual genius upon whom we must rely to lead us on to new truths and to open up new experiences. The notion of corporate inspiration seems to me untenable, and if it were accepted in the sphere of art a committee of poets would be appointed to write a poem, or a parcel of painters to produce a portrait. That a roomful of officials of a religious institution should claim to be "guided by the Holy Spirit" just seems to be pious exaggeration.'

We may add that this type of ecclesiastical megalomania is not confined to groups. It is not long since an eminent Anglican ecclesiastic, speaking of the responsibilities attaching to his position, said, 'I try to remember that he who holds this office must be much more than an ecclesiastic or a personage in the public life of the country. He must be the chief spokesman of God to his fellow-countrymen.' Unfortunately for such claims, whether made by an individual ecclesiastic or by 'a roomful of officials,' the modern man is disinclined to accept them at their face value, and, as Mr. Hardwick insists, 'an authority which is disputed is in danger of becoming no longer an authority.'

Within the Church of Mr. Hardwick's vision, a Church which, while preserving the religious riches of the past, is a sphere of creative activity, the individual who is not himself endowed with genius finds scope for the activities in which all can share, for prayer, meditation, and various forms of discipline and training. Nay, more; for Mr. Hardwick suspects that we all at times enter that mysterious 'other world' whence genius receives its

* *Freedom and Authority in Religion.* Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc. (Skeffington and Son. The Modernist Series. 1932. Price 3/6.)

inspiration, though it is only the genius who can say what he has found there.

Such is Mr. Hardwick's ideal of a Christian Church. As against it the actual Church stands in tragic contrast. Compared with what it might be and ought to be, Mr. Hardwick describes modern religion as 'moribund, formal, and lifeless.' The prestige of religious institutions is low, lower than that, for instance, of scientific institutions. They give standardized answers to standardized questions. Their fundamental defect is that they treat the inheritance of the past as a sacrosanct deposit and 'fence it in with barbed wire to prevent people making illicit additions to it.'

> 'On the whole, I think secularists and unbelievers do far less harm to religion than the Churches with their frantic attempts to preserve everything unchanged. By seeking to immobilize religion they not only keep it from growing, but they keep it from living, for an organism cannot keep alive save by adapting itself to its environment and by continuous process of internal metabolism.'

Mr. Hardwick finds causes contributory to the revolt from religious authority in the emergence of a clearer sense of personal individuality, in a mastery over nature which detracts from that sense of dependence which, according to Schleiermacher, is of the essence of religion, and in the failure of the Church to establish mental contact with the citizen of the modern industrial state. He is rightly severe on quack remedies for our present distresses. The fetish of organization, the side-tracking of energy into social and philanthropic channels, the cult of efficiency all pass under unfavourable review. Particularly does he condemn the pitiful attempt to find a refuge from reality by playing at mediaevalism:

> 'One more truly extraordinary yet now quite common method of seeking to resuscitate lost authority is to imagine that the modern world no longer exists, and to play at being mediaeval pilgrims, monks, mass-priests, nuns, and what not (the new rage for pageants is psychologically closely allied with all this). In a cathedral city, and still more in a cathedral close, it requires little force of imagination to believe that the modern world actually has never come into existence, so it is in these dim asylums that this strange vogue flourishes. Deans fit out their cathedrals like arts and crafts emporia, and flit about prettily dressed up, to the delight of diocesan spinsters. It all goes down well with an extremely limited circle, but the outside world knows not whether to smile or to sigh at such antics.'

Mr. Hardwick's criticism is no less just than mordant, and it is not surprising that his book ends with a large question mark. Will the Churches bring themselves to get into reverse gear before it is too late? That Mr. Hardwick's book comes from a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England encourages us to hope that, so far as our own Church is concerned, the answer may be favourable. But, who can say?

G. L. H. Harvey.

ETHICAL REALISM*

The conflict still rages between ethics on a naturalistic basis and ethics that profess to ground themselves on eternal essences. In a lengthy article in the *International Journal of Ethics* for January, 1930, entitled 'A Critique

**Ethics.* By Nicolai Hartmann. Translated by Stanton Coit. Vol. I, *Moral Phenomena,* pp. 343; Vol. II, *Moral Values,* pp. 476; Vol. III, *Moral Freedom,* pp. 288. (George Allen & Unwin: 1932. Prices 12/6, 16/- and 12/6.)

of Ethical Realism,' Dr. Sidney Hook called attention to 'the most comprehensive systematic treatise on ethics which has ever been published,' *Ethik*, by Nicolai Hartmann. He then proceeded to attack its absolutistic pretensions as unwarranted and prompted by the vain 'wish for certainty.' Yet in Dr. Hartmann's analysis of the moral life, Dr. Hook acknowledges that he 'has had only one great predecessor—Aristotle.' The article incited Dr. Stanton Coit to obtain from the author the right of translation into English. The result is three considerable volumes, under the general title of *Ethics*.*

It is an enormous work, written with characteristic German *Gründlichkeit*. The author leads his readers up to the fundamental problems and theses along tortuous paths of preliminary discussion of their more immediate and obvious aspects. There are masses of abstract argument, devoid of concrete illustrations to assist the understanding, subtle distinctions and balancing of pros and cons and intricate webs of comparisons and contrasts. All this is apt to discourage those without a bent for this sort of literature who might yet be capable of an intelligent interest in the central themes of the book. There is too much of this kind of systematization: 'If one draws into this perspective the law of grade in the scales of values, according to which the higher-lying (the lesser) disvalue corresponds to the higher value, one sees that in the "beginning" of valuational diversity, the positive pole of the scale falls at the indifference-level and the negative must have lain at the lowest point below; that is, it must have been the heaviest disvalue, the absolute anti-value, in which every valuable constituent is annihilated.' It takes time to think out, and after several pages of this sort of thing one gets tired. Yet the work, as a whole, is by no means difficult for a philosophical treatise. There are large tracts of easy style, with crisp and lively sentences, and arguments enriched with passion and pathos—for instance, the sub-section on 'Striving for Happiness and Capacity for Happiness' (Vol. I, p. 149 foll.). There are also passages of striking beauty and nobility, such as in the chapters on 'Radiant Virtue' (Vol. II, p. 332 foll.) and on 'Personal Love' (Vol. II, p. 365).

Dr. Hartmann's fundamental thesis is to be found in Section V of Part I, called 'The Essence of Ethical Values.' He maintains that values are independent of human consciousness. 'The deeper one forces one's way into the heart of ethical phenomena, so much the more evident become the apriority and the all-dominating character of values as essences' (Vol. I, p. 198). 'Values have self-existence . . . Values subsist independently of the consciousness of them. Consciousness can grasp or miss them, but cannot make them or spontaneously decree them' (Vol. I, p. 218). They are as independent as logical or mathematical truths, such as that $a^0 = 1$ (Vol. I, p. 223). 'The moral judgment of values, which declares that a breach of trust is revolting or that malicious joy in another's misfortune is reprehensible, does not refer to the sensation as revolting or reprehensible . . . It means something objective, somthing existing in itself. But, of course, a self-existence that is of an ideal nature' (Vol. I, 225). Indeed, Dr. Hartmann views moral values as Plato did the Ideas. 'There is a realm of values subsisting for itself, a genuine κόσμος νοητός which exists beyond reality just as much as beyond consciousness—an ethical ideal sphere, not manufactured, invented or dreamed, but actually existing and capable of being grasped in the phenomenon of the feeling for values—a sphere which perdures side by side with the ethical real and the ethical actual sphere, just as the logical ideal realm exists side by side with the ontological real and the gnoseological positive realm' (Vol. I, p. 220).

But though values are self-existent 'independently of their own actualization,' they are by no means indifferent to actuality. They are 'principles of the actual ethical sphere' (Vol. I, p. 237). They are both weaker and stronger than the logical categories. 'They do not rule unconditionally,' but 'they are creative principles. They can transform Not-Being into Being' (Vol. I, p. 238). And this they do through man. Upon the task of actualizing values depends 'the unique position and dignity of man in the world, his difference from other entities which do not participate in the creative process' (Vol. I, p. 242). The self-existent values are the source of obligation—of 'Ought-to-Be' and 'Ought-to-Do' (Vol. I, Section VI). 'The moral subject' allows himself to be determined by the Ought emanating from the self-existent values, and so 'moulds, transforms and builds up: he is a world-creator in little' (Vol. I, p. 260). And thus he becomes in the fullest sense personal. 'Only through the intrusion of values as determining powers into his actional sphere does the subject become that which he morally is, a person' (Vol. I, p. 268).

Dr. Hartmann, though he opposes naturalism, repudiates theism, which he calls 'metaphysical personalism' (Vol. I, chapter xxv). Further, he rejects all 'teleological metaphysics' or 'cosmic teleology,' as derogatory to human dignity. 'A thorough cosmic teleology utterly nullifies ethics. It is a theory of predestination—whether theistic, pantheistic or atheistic—and leaves fatalism as the only standpoint for man' (Vol. I, p. 287). 'The phenomena of the moral consciousness of man as a personal being is incompatible with cosmic teleology' (Vol. I, p. 288). 'The uniqueness of man in his cosmic position is lost sight of . . . The metaphysical humanization of the Absolute is the moral annulment of man' (Vol. I, p. 290). Again, he speaks of the 'personalistic idea of God and its all-depressing preponderance' (Vol. I, p. 343).

It is difficult to think that this hypostatization of moral values can long maintain itself against its two sworn foes—sheer naturalism on the one side and the theistic world-view on the other. One can appreciate to some degree what Dr. Hartmann means when he compares the self-existence of moral values to the self-existence of mathematical truths. Kindness would be better than cruelty, and any two sides of a triangle would together be greater than the third (at any rate in Euclidean space), even though there were no beings to be kind or cruel, and no triangles to have sides. They would be ideal truths which would become actual under appropriate conditions, quite apart from any action of Deity. Thought is such as to have to think these truths, if compelled to choose between them and their contraries, and reality is such as necessarily to be like this if forced to be either so or the opposite. And yet that these moral values or ideals should exercise such a fascination upon men as to induce them to live and labour and die for them, or indeed that men should be able to conceive of them at all, needs explaining.

In the second volume Dr. Hartmann gives an elaborate exposition and analysis of these values, both the strictly moral and the other values of human life, in various grades and relations. His thought shows strains derived from Aristotle, from the Christian *ethos*, and from Nietzsche. In his chapter on the 'Love of the Remote' (Vol. II, chapter xxx) he attempts to evaluate Nietzsche's conception of 'Fernstenliebe' (love of the remotest) in contrast to 'Nächstenliebe' (love of the nearest), the former tending to progress, the latter to present welfare. He appears not to be aware that the Christian love for neighbours aims also at the remote, at their perfection as children of God.

In the third volume Dr. Hartmann deals at length with the problem of the freedom of the will. He upholds a freedom, not only from natural causation, but also from the ideal moral values. The proof of it lies in the facts—in the 'ethical phenomena solely and alone' (Vol. III, p. 129). What these ethical phenomena are, he sets forth in a series of chapters—on the moral judgment, on responsibilities, on the consciousness of guilt, on other lesser moral facts, on the relation of the Ought to the will. He then undertakes to prove the 'ontological possibility' of personal freedom (Vol. III, Section V). He recognizes that freedom is not full and universal in human nature. 'Ordinarily man is in many directions not accountable and responsible; perhaps he is indeed never wholly responsible, never quite a free being. But he may be so—in principle—and he ought to be so. Moral freedom means standing upon the summit of humanity, and not everyone can attain that height at every moment' (Vol. III, p. 243).

Dr. Hartmann's anti-religious bias comes out strongly in his final chapter, 'Ethical and Religious Freedom.' In this he states five apparently insoluble antinomies that arise from the impact of religion on ethics: (1) between this world and a better world beyond, (2) between the good of man and the fulfilment of the will of God, (3) between ethical values as autonomous and ethical values as expressions of the Divine will, (4) between the freedom of man and the providence of God, (5) between permanent moral responsibility and salvation. In all these cases Dr. Hartmann represents the antagonism as harsher and more irreconciliable than it is commonly felt to be by the religious consciousness. He concludes with a scornful allusion to 'the philosophy of religion . . . confronted here with what is for ever insoluble, an enigma, an irrationality which can never be removed.'

Dr. Nicolai Hartmann's *Ethics* is a very proud book. It is proud in the logical assurance of its marching arguments. It is proud in its parade of imposing system and minute and intricate analysis. It is proud in its promotion of ethics to the supreme place among human studies. It is proud in its exaltation of the moral consciousness as that whereby man has contact with the ideal values. It is proud in the glorification of man as the being through whom alone, so far as the evidence discloses, the ideal values achieve actualization. It is proud indeed in its dismissal of the hypothesis of God as incompatible with human dignity.

But this pride is blinding. It blinds the author to, or causes him to ignore, both the place of religion in human nature and the values of religious experience. It blinds him to the difficulty of accounting for man with his boasted moral power and glory. It blinds him to the importance of that side of the moral nature denoted by the terms 'humility' and 'meekness.' It blinds him to the futilities and tragedies of man's existence, to his sin and frailty and corruption, to his consequent pitiful lack of freedom. It even appears to blind him to the fact of man's mortality and the brevity of his present existence, since there is scarcely a mention of death throughout the treatise. Or is it not so much blindness as fear—fear of facing the distressing and humiliating facts?

It is a pity. For if it were not for this devastating and numbing pride, the author's wide intellectual grasp and penetrating intellectual acumen, his magnificent thoroughness and industry, his fine enthusiasm for goodness and humanity, might have enabled him to produce something truly great, a book really effective, not to say epoch-making, in the development of the ethical thought of mankind.

F.A.M.S.

WESTCOTT'S FEAR.*

In the last decade of the nineteenth century Bishop Westcott of Durham, persuaded, and we had almost said over-persuaded, by some of his disciples, permitted 'concurrent communion' of the sick, or, as he himself termed it, 'coincident communion.' The disciple who writes this book, one of those responsible for the persuasion, is anxious to establish that his Master (to whom he refers with a capital 'M') did not thereby lend countenance to the practice of Reservation; on the contrary, that he had fear lest it should be introduced as permissible within the Church of England. There was, as the Bishop is quoted to have said, 'no matter upon which he felt more strongly.' To judge by the documents and sayings reported in this book, there is no doubt the disciple makes his actual case; but we venture to doubt if he vindicates the Bishop's original action, about which the disciple himself is uneasy and honestly admits as much (p. 109).

The inspiration and 'authority' for coincident communion the Bishop and his disciples found in Justin Martyr's description of a second century Eucharist service. The disciple who is our author conflates what are two accounts in Justin, but there is little dispute about the relevant words and their meaning. In his *First Apology* Justin describes a Baptism and tells how the newly-baptized is brought 'to where the brethren, as they are called, are gathered together.' Prayer is then offered, 'for ourselves, for the newly-enlightened (baptized), and for all others everywhere.' 'Afterwards is brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of water and wine, and he takes it and offers up praise and glory . . .' Later, 'the deacons, as we call them, allow everyone of those present to partake . . .; and for those absent they take away a portion' (Gwatkin's Translation). The last words are the immediate interest. On the strength of them Bishop Westcott permitted, not generally but specifically in two parishes, the clergy to bear the consecrated elements from the Church to the sick who were to have followed for themselves the Communion Service in their beds. Our author describes the Bishop's idea. 'While the congregation were partaking, one of the clergy taking part in the service was almost unobserved to quietly withdraw from the sanctuary with such of the bread and wine as was deemed sufficient in his hands and without ostentation make his way to the house where the sick communicant lay.'

The Bishop's intention was promptly misunderstood by those not unanxious to do so. At a hearing concerning Reservation held before the Archbishops at Lambeth in 1899 the new practice at Durham was cited as precedent for Reservation. The Bishop writes indignantly to deny the imputation:

> 'I have just seen, with great surprise, that Mr. Hansell stated . . . that I have authorized Reservation in certain cases. I have not done anything of the kind. What I have done is that I have endeavoured to show how the cases in which Reservation is declared to be necessary may be met without Reservation.' (There follows an account of what he did do, and of his authority in Justin.)

It is difficult to dogmatize on Westcott's position concerning the Eucharist because he did not clearly pronounce on it himself, but it is worth discovering what he did not hold, and the cause of his hesitation to make positive statement, since the question is still urgently with us. This book provides the necessary material.

* *Westcott's Fear.* By a Disciple. (Heffers, Cambridge: 1930. Price 6/-.)

The practice of Reservation implies a belief that the act of consecration works *some* change in the bread and wine. It is our conviction, and so far as we can gather the conviction of our author, that wherever and however that belief is held, while Reservation and worship of the Elements does not in practice always follow, in the logic of devotion it does follow. Thus our author examines Justin's account and finds that Justin taught belief in a change in the words 'Not as common bread and common drink do we receive these, but like as Jesus Christ . . . took both flesh and blood . . . so also are we taught that the (Eucharistic) food . . . is both flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh,' and reminds us that already by the close of Justin's century the consecrated Elements were sent from Church to Church as 'tokens of orthodoxy,' and how Tertullian advised a fasting man 'to take away the body of the Lord and reserve it till his fast should be over.' By the next century Cyprian of Carthage could vouch that the Elements on occasion defended themselves by emitting fire, and before the coming of the barbarian the Host was used as a charm against sickness, shipwreck and robbers. It is significant that Councils and Canons fulminated and legislated against such misuse in vain. Through the crack in their theory, which they would or could close no more than will or can our own authorities, poured in the flood of evil practice. With the coming of the illiterate and so literal-minded barbarian, the whole development was epitomized and perpetuated by reading and teaching the words 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' in a sense clean contrary to the figurative sense in which plainly they were first used (pp. 35, 36).

Justin cannot be held responsible for the development of belief after him, and still less for the ridiculous practices associated with that belief; but his own teaching did not hinder that development, and a case can and has been made out that the germ is contained in what he said. That is the issue. Bishop Westcott's permission of coincident communion, based on the *First Apology,* does not justify the present theories and practices connected with Reservation, but in so far as his permission implied belief in *some* change on consecration, he initiated for his day what others have developed as they wished. On the same grounds we cannot share our author's enthusiasm for the English Prayer Book. Granted that the Calvinism evident in the work of the Reformers of 1552 conceives of the Presence as in the heart of the devout receiver (p. 80), yet the Prayer Book Service as a whole, and especially the Prayer of Humble Access, the first part of the words of administration (which our author is strangely glad about) and the rubric directing veiling, is open, in the logic of devotion, to that interpretation put upon it by Archbishop Temple's Charge of 1898, which found the 'Lutheran' view permissible, and further open, pursuing that same logic, to the interpretation of those who to-day would practise Reservation. Such interpretation of the Prayer Book is a partial one, and in the light of Article Twenty-five even a strained one, but a purely Calvinistic interpretation is as partial.

What Bishop Westcott did not intend, this book makes plain enough; what he did intend is not so plain. His disciple quotes a letter to the Archbishop of York of October, 1900. 'I am utterly unable to understand how "the Body broken" and "the Blood shed" can be identified with the Person of the Lord'; and again, from the same correspondence, '. . . it seems vital to me to guard against the thought of the Presence of the Lord "in or under the forms of bread and wine."' Behind his objection to such thought lay rather a vital view of the nature and work of the Ascended Lord than positive scientific questioning of the Lutheran or the

Reservationists' claims, but the temper of his meaning is unmistakable in what he said to his Chaplain after attendance at Lambeth, where clerical ritual irregularities had been discussed: '. . . the points specially in evidence have been only symptomatic; . . . there is beneath a deep cleavage with those who will be satisfied with nothing but the readmission of medievalism. And war is inevitable' (p. 16). Of the same occasion he wrote to his wife: 'Certainly there was very much to cause alarm. I feel sure that . . . a war is inevitable. The causes alleged may be trivial, but behind there is the conflict of Roman and Anglican principles which are absolutely irreconcilable, and I cannot fight. Alas! fighters are needed.'

'I cannot fight.' That note recurs often in the book. Yet here is fighting of a sort which, except colloquially, the word hardly fits. Why did Westcott hesitate to make plain statement and defence of his faith in the matter of the Holy Communion? The Archbishops at Lambeth in 1900 in their two Opinions decided that Westcott's permission of coincident communion was not permission of a form of Reservation, and he rejoiced at their decision; but what his own positive position was remains conjectural. Our author compares it with Luther's only to distinguish it therefrom, and suggests the Bishop held that the whole service, and not only consecration, makes real the Presence. Thus the Bishop deplored the Prayer Book's abbreviation of our Lord's words of institution. Our author also understands Westcott's reluctance (which would be as good a title for this book) to state his case, but sympathizes with it more approvingly than we are able to do. Speaking of the School of Westcott and Hort, Dean Armitage Robinson in 1926 said, 'The problems of the Eucharist were not among those to which their strenuous labours were devoted' (p. 115), and Westcott sheds further light, 'I shrink with my whole nature from speaking of such a mystery' (p. 113). In those words, no matter how much we respect the spirit of them, he vitiated and clouded his position and left it open, despite his protests, to what interpretations Reservationists might put upon it. Did Westcott believe the act of consecration worked some change, or did he not? It is impossible to say; but possible to surmise from the hints he does give that to-day he would flatly declare he did not.

Westcott's feeling that the consecration is a mystery and not to be discussed is popular to-day, and in high quarters. It is rooted in the ambiguity of the Prayer Book; and in a sense of reverence which if muddled is religious, so that one hesitates to attack it. It was a view enunciated again and again, and authoritatively, during the controversy around the Deposited Book. It will not do. It is an unfair position because, on examination, it is at once a statement and an attempt to silence opponents beforehand, since none easily attacks another who pleads his religious susceptibilities, and one hesitates to incur the charge of insensitive handling of holy things. But in fact the plea of mystery adumbrates not an agnosticism, but a position concerning the consecration. If consecration works no change there is no mystery about it. About the service as a whole, indeed, there is mystery, the mystery attendant on all human activity in relation to the Divine. But to think of this mystery as restricted to the consecration act not only belittles it, rendering what is mystery nearer magic, but also, no matter how carefully its statement be guarded, unbolts the floodgates to materialistic and unscientific conceptions that lead, and in too many dioceses to-day where authority holds such a view of the mystery, to practices and forms of worship to be condemned, not because they are Roman, but because they are superstitious and so sub-Christian. We agree that Westcott is proved to have had fear of such unspiritual ways of worship; we regret

that he, with his immense prestige, did not do more to safeguard in this matter the Church which he so devotedly and straightly served. It was left for the House of Commons to ignore the plea of mystery together with a multitude of other over-fine distinction-makings, and with that perspicacity not unusual in those fresh to a situation, to single out even a reduced Reservation as implying belief inconsistent with the Reformed Church as Englishmen to-day understand it.

The arrangement and the style of this book are most involved. The parentheses are intolerable. 'Berengar, we note by the way, . . . testifies, etc.'; the dots here represent seventy-eight words in the text. We do not see the advantage of quoting Greek in English characters. But there is much interesting material and some radical thinking in this book for those who will trouble to dig it out, and the author has done good service in calling attention to Westcott's apprehensions which the subsequent course of our English Church history has so amply justified.

M.T.D.

TEACHING THE BIBLE*

A reviewer of books about the Bible, intended for children or for adult beginners in the study of it, must indeed take unto himself the courage lent by Mr. Shaw's reflection that while a man cannot lay an egg he is none the less a competent judge of a bad one. Only it is unfortunate that books are a special variety of egg, and that the curate's.

Five out of these six books are concerned to present the Old Testament simply. It is a task of the extremest difficulty, infinitely easier to criticise when accomplished than to do. On the one hand the Old Testament, both as a book of religion, and of history, taken as a whole, is for the most part either incomprehensible or dangerously misleading and dangerously suggestive unless the reader has a fair understanding of the complicated process by which it came to be written. As Mr. Wrigley says, 'To refuse to listen to the great scholars in any branch of science, and especially in the branch of historical criticism, is as futile as it is pathetic'; and he quotes with approval the late Bishop Gore, 'The time has come when no teaching of the Old Testament can be adequate except it is frankly based on the assured results of Biblical criticism.' But how to convey, even as a basis, sufficient of these assured results to children and beginners? While if the Old Testament be regarded simply as a collection of stories, many are highly undesirable stories; and what shall be our canon of selection, especially remembering that some of the more *risqué* have, naturally, contributed fruitfully to the growth of our own language and literature? Nor should history in the Old Testament be studied in isolation from other history. The chief fault in the Church's presentation of history has been her prejudiced selection of certain portions as alone significant. Miss Ursula Wells rightly attempts to place the prophets against their world-background; but the sharper the background the less significant the

* *The Church's Times and Seasons.* W. J. S. and Sibyl Weir. (S.P.C.K.: 1932. Price 2/6.)

The Eighth Century Prophets and *A Short Religious History of Israel.* (The first two of seven volumes.) By E. W. Hammond, M.A. (S.C.M. Press: 1932. Price 4/- each.)

The Old Testament in the Light of Modern Scholarship. Francis Wrigley, B.A. (Independent Press: 1932. Price 5/-.)

Prophets of Judah on the Background of History. Ursula Wells, S.Th., L.T. (S.P.C.K.: 1932. Price 4/6.)

Stories and Lessons. Part I: Genesis. Marion Power. (S.P.C.K.: 1932. Price 3/-.)

prophets, and *vice versa*. If we decide to emphasise neither Old Testament nor world history, how then avoid mere recording, or a fatal division of interest? On the other hand, the science of education, though rapidly advancing, has already agreed upon certain principles of teaching and these are so hard of application to teaching of the Old Testament that most teachers, if truth be told, have long given up any serious attempt to do so, avoiding the Old Testament where they can or, if compelled, using it as a book for what amounts to reading-lessons. For instance, children should be taught as little as possible that later they must unlearn. What shall we do, in obedience to this, with narratives of a primitive natural or moral outlook—the story of the Red Sea or Jordan crossings, Joshua and the sun, the story of Abraham's sacrificial intention, Samuel's command to Saul concerning Agag, and a hundred others? Not that children taught such stories will have to be dissuaded from trying to do likewise—children are too sensible—but the idea of God such tales inculcate will later have to be abandoned. In the modern world, in practice, it is abandoned at about sixteen years of age, and usually, we fear, not for a better but for none. Again it is heresy to think there be any merit in teaching children facts for their own sake; already the modern generation yawns at mere information imparted for its good, and its last interest is antiquarian. But within what 'project' can we teach the Old Testament—as other than a collection of tales and legends—with its multitudinous scenes and kings, passages of beauty and strange high import, harangues and books and names? So little, moreover, of the Old Testament is intelligible unless we grasp also nearly as great a multitude of facts and theories in commentaries about it. Indeed, before anyone teaches anyone else the Old Testament it is, we think, essential that he should in quiet ask himself: Why teach it at all? Mr. Hammond has done so and his answers form the preface of both his volumes. Whatever our answers, probably no longer will anyone conclude that the whole of the book should be taught to any save advanced students and likely specialists. Hence we welcome yet another selection of readings in Mr. Wrigley's book. This is not all. If the 'facts-heresy' be anathema, so also, for children under twelve or thirteen years of age, is the teaching of abstractions, which no child under that age can grasp. Mr. and Mrs. Weir are awake to this. Their book is designed 'to deliver the child from the Egypt of abstractions.'

It will be seen from our use of quotations that our authors are aware to some extent of their problem and its complexity. We venture to award the first three places to the book by Mr. and Mrs. Weir; the book on the prophets by Mr. Hammond; and the selection of readings made by Mr. Wrigley.

The Church's Times and Seasons is a book of Sunday School lessons for children aged eight to fourteeen years arranged, but with imagination, to follow the Church's Calendar. Each Sunday's section has an Aim, Bible Passage, Teacher's Introduction, and Lesson in simple language mainly in story-form. We are particularly glad to see expectation and provision for Expression work, called in this book 'Meditation.' No attempt is made to follow through the life of Christ or any other chronological order. The book deals mainly with the New Testament and there is great variety of treatment. We start in Advent with Zacharias, carols, and so forth; move on to think of 'God manifested'; and after a lesson on Creation (Septuagesima), devote Lent to a study of love, and Trinity to learning how the Gospel came to Britain and to a description of the synagogue at Caper-

naum and the services in which Jesus must have taken part. There are more modern stories and references than Biblical and, in criticism, we would suggest there are too many facts and ideas in each lesson and that a teacher would be well advised to grasp the lesson as a whole and select according to age of class from this abundant though interesting material. It is a good book and we recommend it for use in Sunday School or Church Day School.

The Eighth Century Prophets consists of those portions of the prophets now generally accepted as authentic (erring if anywhere on the radical side) placed, for each prophet, in a suggested historical sequence. Thus Isaiah is set out: i, 1; vi, 1-12; v, 1-14; v, 19-24, etc. Mr. Hammond has made a free rhythmical translation from the Hebrew which, as he claims, does save many explanatory comments, the text helping to interpret itself as it runs. His translation reads often very well.

> Yea, let us know,
> Let us be zealous to know Yahweh,
> Whose going forth
> Is sure as the dawn,
> He will come forth for us
> As the torrent rain,
> As the spring rain
> That watereth the earth.
> What can I make of you, Ephraim?
> What can I make of you, Israel?
> Your goodness is like a morning cloud,
> Like the dew that vanisheth early. (Hosea, vi, 3-4.)

Perhaps on the whole it had been better to have used, if not the Revised Version, then the admirable translation done by Dr. Moffatt. On the left side of the text are brief explanatory paraphrases; on the right, useful references to the New Testament; and there are ample but not burdensome comments, about six to a page, as footnotes. Each prophet is introduced by a readable *resumé* of the main conclusions of modern scholarship about the man, his circumstances, date and purpose. The dating is over-bold. The book concludes with a table of subjects discussed by the prophets; an historical chart; and condensed analyses of all the books. Dr. Cyril Norwood writes a short preface. The author suggests the book to be suitable for upper forms and perhaps middle, but we exactly reverse this advice.

Mr. Hammond's *Short Religious History of Israel* is not a book of the same quality as his other. The Old Testament may be taught as a religious book, as history, or even, conceivably, as it was written, a religiously-prejudiced view of history, but the teacher must make up his mind one way or another. Mr. Hammond's error is an old one, to treat it as a special kind of history in which God-intervention is peculiarly present, though he is sufficiently aware of the difficulties so raised to be irritatingly vague. From Mr. Hammond's book may be derived little understanding of the Old Testament peoples and Empires, their customs, laws, needs and ambitions, and it is altogether too slight for young men who, while they study it, may be preparing for a History scholarship at one of the senior Universities.

The Old Testament, in the Light of Modern Scholarship is a collection of extracts from the Revised Version. Nearly every section is preceded by a connecting explanatory note mainly based on the Commentary edited by Dr. Peake and that published by the S.P.C.K. Direct quotations from

both commentaries frequently make up the note. The extracts begin with the Pentateuch (why not the Hexateuch?); follow through the historical narratives to the fall of Jerusalem; go on to the prophets; and conclude with the Wisdom literature, the books of later Judaism and the Psalms. There is a good index. It would be a useful book to leave lying about the house and should help to encourage this generation to read some of the lovelier and more important passages of the Old Testament.

Prophets of Judah attempts to place the prophets from Isaiah to Jonah against their historical background. It is a supremely difficult task and much of it is well done, but rather the reconstruction, accenting and exposition of the prophets' messages. The accounts are enlivened by free drawing upon other studies and text-books, with due acknowledgements. Much use is made of Dr. Moffatt's translation, for instance, to bring out the punning in the first chapter of Micah. But the background remains nearly as muddled as it first appears to a beginner in these studies. We are convinced that events so obscure and complex as those behind the Old Testament narratives can only be unravelled and made sensible by plainest statement in closest reference to some chronology, no passage far from a date. A sense of melodrama is a positive hindrance. About Ezekiel we read, 'Did they turn away in mocking incredulity or hot anger from the fanatic, with his gloomy insinuations, while he answered them not a word?'—a rhetorical question of a tone too often audible in this book.

We cannot commend *Stories and Lessons* by Marion Power. Children of eight to ten years cannot understand the intricacies of J. E. D. P. and the Redactors, and it is futile to try and make them by giving each a little diagrammatic presentation of the theory. The Lessons are too generalised and abstract and much harder and less pleasurable for a child than the Scripture on which they are based. An infant cannot know what 'His Spirit is always with us, guiding us into all Truth,' means, and there is a fatal addiction to pious phraseology. This book is not really free, though it tries to be, of the influence of that school which teaches a child his Scripture obscurely because at heart it is afraid lest he should understand. A child so young appreciates little more than either out-and-out fairy-stories, which it secretly recognises as such, or simple narratives of people doing ordinary things. Nor is the selection of stories altogether suitable. It is a mistake to attempt the introduction of a child of nine to the misbehaviour of Potiphar's wife who fell in love with Joseph because 'he was good-looking and attractive.' And what shall a child make of the information that Joseph, being 'faithful to his master, would not take any notice of her,' which made her angry, 'so she told her husband that Joseph had insulted her'?

There is one grave teaching difficulty mentioned in none of these books, perhaps naturally, since it is outside their range. What of the general plan of a child's education in Bible and religion? Usually there is none. Children of fifteen in Sunday School or even Day School may be learning simple stories, and children of eight attempting a history of the Hebrews, while, at any rate in most Sunday Schools, there is no planned purpose or order in the sequence of lessons, an episode from the life of Jesus, teaching about a Saint or a Festival, an Old Testament story and a Catechism-lesson following each other each week and leaving the dimmest and most higgledy-piggledy impressions. Again, where a general order is aimed at, too frequently it arranges for the progress of the child during its education twice or thrice or maybe four times through the same subject or subject-scheme, though each time, deliberately, more fully and with greater detail. This, the 'concentric' theory at work, has long been abandoned by

educationalists. For interesting reasons connected with the modern understanding of curiosity, purpose and memory, any such system of repetition is now regarded as disastrous to growth of both knowledge and mind. Yet how to avoid it? Without attempting here any answer we venture none the less to close with this advice to all teachers of religion. Let the clergyman or teacher, as a first step, read if only a little of modern educational theory and then work out a broad general syllabus, not for a term or a year, but for the whole period during which the pupil will be under him or his successors; a task both the more difficult and the more hopeful for the clergyman, who is concerned with pupils from their infancy to perhaps the close of the 'teens. Such a broad syllabus would be detailed in particular schemes, one for each year of age, the schemes interconnected and deliberately planned to take their proper places in the general programme. Without some such programme most education, religious or other, is wasted.

Four of the books here reviewed could usefully be used at appropriate stages of such a long-view plan. M.T.D.

CORRESPONDENCE

PERMANENT RESERVATION OF THE SACRAMENT IN WINCHESTER CATHEDRAL.

SIR,

It will doubtless surprise many of your readers, as it did most of our own clergy and laity the other day, to be told that Permanent Reservation has been introduced in Winchester Cathedral.

This important innovation—its own advocates must treat it as such—was made surreptitiously a year ago—without a word being ever said in what claims to be 'the official communication between the Bishop and the clergy and laity of the diocese, and a means of disseminating diocesan information'—no mention in the notices of the Cathedral services appearing month by month in its pages—no reference in the episcopal pastoral letter which prefaces every number. We are deliberately kept in the dark. Justification of the practice purporting to be for the sick only, itself of course absolutely illegal, is sought in—(i) the consent of a bishop on the verge of fatal illness; (ii) the months it has already been in force; (iii) the requirements of 'a large number of elderly people within the Cathedral grounds, some of them invalids'!

A highly objectionable secret development of the Oxford Movement was denounced by Archbishop Tait as 'a conspiracy within our own body against the doctrine, the discipline, and the practice of our reformed church.'

What else is this?

W. H. COBB.

Oak House, Baughurst, Basingstoke.
November 19th, 1932.

THE EPISCOPAL FAILURE TO ENFORCE CLERICAL DISCIPLINE.

SIR,

In one of your Notes in last month's issue you speak as if the Establishment makes for the formation of an enlightened Protestantism, and that it preserves the Church of England from excessive clericalism. Apparently it has done so recently by rejecting a revised Prayer Book which proposed to sanction certain approximations to Roman practices in connection with Holy Communion. But what effect has this rejection had in parishes? In this

part of the country common report says that it has had hardly any effect at all; that not only in very many churches are practices followed which the rejected book allowed, but that other practices which were considered too superstitious to be sanctioned are in weekly and daily use. In some parishes the congregations are pleased, in others they acquiesce, but in most cases there is alienation between incumbent and people and the churches are deserted. What Parliament does is not to provide the people with an enlightened Protestantism, but to endow a parson with authority and power to do as he pleases. When the parson is a reasonably educated and sympathetic man, the result is not unsatisfactory. But if the parson wants to have his own way, he can take it however perverse it may be, if his income is protected. To take this perverse way is becoming the ideal of more and more clergymen. They do not want popularity or success or influence, they want to do the things which they are persuaded are the right things, although the result may be the alienation of the people whom they often come to regard as strangers to Christian ideals of faith and conduct.

We speak of union with other bodies, of regaining the Methodists, of an alliance with the Presbyterians, and sometimes contrast the favourable attitude of their leaders with the indifference or hostility of the rank and file of their members. But how can it be supposed that Methodist or Presbyterian lay people should like our patronage system? The slightest study of the two successful union movements of our time, that of the two Presbyterian churches in Scotland, and that of the three Methodist churches in Great Britain, will show how the voice of the layman has made itself heard in a positive and not merely a negative way.

The Bishops and the Church Assembly may have blundered in their conduct of the revised book through Parliament. But the rejection, however caused, has had the most serious effects, the state of things in the church being the opposite of what Parliament may reasonably have been supposed to desire. On the one hand in some dioceses little or nothing has been done to restrain the adoption of superstitious practices, which have even been introduced into new parishes. On the other hand the Bishops have adopted an interpretation of the consequences of their defeat which seems to some of us unduly timid. All through the long years when the Prayer Book was under consideration, attention was repeatedly given to the question and answer addressed to young men at the serious and solemn moment of ordination, and a new question and answer were provided. Now, apparently, the labour of a score of years has gone for nothing and is to go for nothing, for because of the rejection the Bishops found themselves compelled to ask young men about to dedicate themselves to the service of the ministry a question about the Holy Scriptures and to return an answer to that question which they, the ordaining Bishops, think ought not to be asked or answered in this way.

No one who dreads disestablishment of the Church of England need be in any fear, for few and feeble indeed are those who deem it a practical question. Whether this is a good sign or a bad one is a question which would be answered differently, and as usual there would be the wise and the muddleheaded on one side and the wise and the muddleheaded on the other.

C. G. SHARP.

Ealing Vicarage, W.5.
December 3rd, 1932.

We think the failure of the Episcopate to check the Romanization of our Church is not due, as the Vicar of Ealing's letter suggests, to either Establishment or the present Patronage System. It is due, first, to the

immensely powerful and subtle organization with which the episcopate is faced. This organization is resolved at all costs to Romanize the Church, and a united and resolute episcopate determined not simply to check it but to suppress it, would find the task one of extreme difficulty. But our episcopate is neither resolute nor united. The bishops of some of our most important sees are themselves supporters of the Romanizing movement. Other bishops, strongly opposed to Romanization, knowing that episcopal efforts to suppress disorders would draw upon them fierce attacks from the whole Romanizing party, naturally prefer peace and quietness, and so allow things to go on their Romeward way. Apparently every bishop on the bench is resolved not to take legal proceedings or to permit legal proceedings against any Romanizing incumbent. This being so, the Romanizers are able practically to do what they will in that direction.

Without any alteration in our Establishment or in our Patronage System, the bishops could easily secure from Parliament powers to suspend from their ministerial functions all incumbents contumaciously guilty of Romanizing and to sequestrate their livings. But the bishops, for reasons which they would find hard to justify to the lay mind, are unwilling to do this. Hence large numbers of the laity regard the bishops as being secretly in league with the Romanizers.

With regard to the rejection of the Deposited Book by Parliament, the House of Commons rightly interpreted the desire of the majority of Church people. No party in the Church desired the Deposited Book to be authorized. The Anglo-Catholic party was opposed to the Book when it feared it might be authorized, and only supported it after it was rejected. Of course what the bishops ought to have done was what Sir Thomas Inskip and others urged Archbishop Davidson to do, and that was to omit the controversial revision of the Communion Office, and to present the rest of the Book for authorization by Parliament. There is not the slightest doubt but that Parliament would have gladly given such authorization.

How long this *impasse* is to continue who shall say? Parliament can only end it by Disestablishment, and Parliament has too much pressing and difficult work to do to take this drastic course.

Education of the younger clergy and ordinands on modern lines is of course the only secure remedy against Romanization, but this cannot become effective for some years. Meanwhile, the laity are being alienated and the churches deserted in an increasing number of parishes.

ED. *M.C.*

AN ORDER OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

SIR,

I cannot refrain from saying, with reference to Mr. H. W. H. Green's letter on the above subject in the *Modern Churchman* for November, 1932, that Modernist Christianity, as I at least have always seen it, is already nothing other than such an order of the Holy Spirit as Mr. Green desires. Is not the artificial creation of little groups within groups to be on all accounts deplored?

As for the 'danger'—so Mr. Green calls it—that Modernism may 'deteriorate into a merely intellectual movement,' I do not think that there is cause for alarm. The principles and methods of Modernism are comprehensive; and special emphasis can be given to now one aspect more particularly, now another, in accordance with the needs of any individual age. Faced as we are by the superstitious materialism and sacramentalist emotionalism at present so much in vogue, we need have no fear of becoming too rigorously intellectual. In another generation, to be sure, Modernists

might find themselves up against something rather different; and then what may be termed their spiritual strategy could, and, I believe, would, adapt itself to correspond. The glory of our faith consists precisely in that it is adaptable.

J. C. Howe.

Clifton College, Bristol, 8.

THE DOGMATIC TEMPER.

Sir,

I see in Mr. Boys-Smith's letter, commenting on Dr. Major's plea at the Conference, for the recognition of new creeds, which the New Reformation demands, that he suspects the disuse (as of the *Quicunque Vult*) of the Apostles' Creed in Morning and Evening Prayer as likely enough to come quietly before long; 'for many feel difficulties in reciting it as it stands, and many more feel no need of the continual repetition of it when met for common prayer and praise and meditation in the Scriptures.'

In the meantime might we not urge strongly that the Apostles' Creed should be confined to its original use in the Baptismal Service? The Creed belongs properly to the Baptismal Service: it was taught beforehand to the catechumens as the Symbol of the Church's Faith, and rehearsed by them in the hearing of the faithful at their baptism; nor does it appear originally that this public baptismal confession was repeated, as now, in the normal service of the Church, or that it was required to be made on any other occasion but baptism. And it is an interesting point to bear in mind that, according to the Use of Sarum, the Apostles' Creed was said daily at *prime* but was repeated like the Lord's Prayer, inaudibly by the priest and privately by the choir, the former raising his voice at the words *carnis resurrectionem* and the latter making the response *et vitam aeternam. Amen.*

Are we not justified, then, in appealing that until a new creed is forthcoming, the Apostles' Creed should be removed from the daily offices (or repeated silently), of which originally it formed no part, to the Baptismal office alone?

And if the three Creeds were placed together, in the Prayer Book as valuable historical documents for reference as to the earlier beliefs of the church and the doctrinal errors they were at different times called upon to condemn; they would retain, a valuable use, to which no one could object. And the shortening and simplifying of the daily services would gain by their omission from public recitation in church, especially as now they are often brought into the Broadcasting Services to the great distress of many listeners. The Creed could thus be turned to in the Prayer Book, and repeated privately by those whose faith was enriched thereby.

As regards the dogmatic temperament, I wish students, and specially modernist students, would seek for guidance and inspiration in the pages of Bishop Westcott, and in *Lessons from Work*, which is wholly Maurician in tone (p. 7). 'The interpretation of the fundamental Creed is continuous.' 'Christian doctrine, so far as it is a power for life, is not shaped by a logical development of accepted statement, but by the fuller interpretation of the fundamental facts of the Creed in the light of fuller knowledge' (p. 65). 'Christianity is the truth, but Christian doctrine is the partial and progressive approximation in the expression of it.'

H. J. Palmer,
Canon Emeritus of Ripon.

60 Church Walk, Worthing.
November 28th, 1932.

SIR, INTER-COMMUNION AND LAY LEADERSHIP.

Lieut.-Colonel E. N. Mozley's article in the November number of the *Modern Churchman* reads like a trumpet-call to action. Why should the laity of the Church of England, who are after all an integral portion of the Church, wait so passively for the clergy to lead them in this all-important matter of inter-communion? Lieut.-Colonel Mozley has shown very plainly the direction in which the Anglo-Catholics are drawing us. Must we merely watch and bewail, or can we do something to counterbalance this effort?

Suppose that in every parish a certain number of regular communicants were to make it their custom openly to join, say once a year, in the service of the Lord's Supper in some Nonconformist chapel? What could the Bishops and the clergy do? According to the rule of the Lambeth Conference such members of the Church of England would have to be treated as schismatics and be debarred from receiving the sacrament in the parish church.

The real sin of schism surely rests with those who are refusing to acknowledge the common brotherhood which we share with all those who 'keep the feast with the unleavened bread of sincerity.'

CONSTANCE A. LUBBOCK.

Observatory House, Slough.
November 24th, 1932.

SIR, MODERNIST SERMONS IN LONDON.

I should be grateful if you would kindly allow me to call the attention of your readers to the following course of addresses which is being given, by kind permission of the Rev. and Hon. J. G. Adderley, at St. Edmund, King and Martyr, Lombard Street:—

January 12, 1933. *What is the Modern Churchmen's Union.* The Rev. T. J. Wood, M.A.

January 19. *The Gospel Story Regarded as History.* Professor F. C. Burkitt, D.D.

January 26. *Jesus Christ and Wealth.* The Rev. H. D. A. Major, D.D.

February 2. *What we Mean by the Incarnation.* The Rev. Professor J. F. Bethune-Baker, D.D.

The addresses begin at 1.10 p.m.

T. J. WOOD.
Secretary, M.C.U.

THE DOGMA OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

In reference to our statement on page 432 of the November *Modern Churchman* that 'the Vatican Council some fifty years ago . . . decreed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and the Infallibility of the Pope,' a correspondent points out that the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was decreed by Pope Pius IX on his sole authority in 1854 and this dogma was only confirmed later by the Vatican Council. This was the first time in Church History that the Pope had promulgated a dogma without a General Council.

ED. *M.C.*